The Role of Limited Transmitter Cooperation in Secure Communication over the Interference Channel

Parthajit Mohapatra and Chandra R. Murthy
Dept. of ECE, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012, India
Email: {partha, cmurthy}@ece.iisc.ernet.in

arXiv:1402.5359v1 [cs.IT] 21 Feb 2014

Abstract

This work presents novel achievable schemes and outer bounds for the 2-user symmetric interference channel (IC) with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers. First, a deterministic equivalent model of 2-user Gaussian symmetric IC (GSIC) with transmitter cooperation is studied. Achievable schemes are proposed for the deterministic case, which use a combination of interference cancelation, relaying of the other user's data bits, time sharing, and transmission of random bits, depending on the rate of the cooperative link and the relative strengths of the signal and the interference. Outer bounds on the secrecy rate are derived, under different assumptions of providing side information to receivers and partitioning the encoded message/output depending on the relative strength of the signal and the interference. Using the intuitions gained from the deterministic case, achievable schemes and outer bounds are obtained for the Gaussian case. The proposed achievable scheme uses a combination of Marton's coding scheme and stochastic encoding along with dummy information transmission. The results illustrate the benefits of limited transmitter cooperation in facilitating secure communications over 2-user interference channels.

I. Introduction

Interference plays a major role in limiting the performance of a multi-user wireless communication system. Users experience interference due to the broadcast and superposition nature of the medium. Also, owing to the broadcast nature of the medium, the users are susceptible

A part of this work has appeared in [1] and [2].

to eavesdropping. The interference channel (IC) is one of the simplest information theoretic models to analyze the effect of interference on the throughput and secrecy of a multiuser communication system. In the classical IC, the transmitters (and receivers) do not communicate or cooperate with each other. However, in many practical situations, the users are not completely isolated from each other, and, hence, cooperation among them is feasible. Such cooperation can potentially provide significant gains in the achievable throughput in the presence of interference, while simultaneously guaranteeing security. In this work, the role of transmitter cooperation in managing interference and ensuring secrecy is explored by studying the 2-user IC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers.

The notion of information theoretic secrecy was introduced in [3], where secret communication between the transmitter and receiver in the presence of an eavesdropper was considered. Subsequently, in [4], the wiretap channel was introduced, where the legitimate transmitter and receiver communicate in the presence of an eavesdropper, and the eavesdropper listens through a degraded channel. The wiretap channel is generalized in [5], where a general (non-degraded) broadcast channel is assumed, and the transmitter sends common information to the legitimate receiver and eavesdropper along with a confidential message intended for the legitimate receiver. These works exploit the fact that even though the signal has originated from the same source, the signal may arrive at the legitimate receiver and the eavesdropper through different channels.

The IC has been extensively studied over the past few decades, to understand the effects of interference on the performance limits of multi-user communication systems. The capacity region of the Gaussian IC (GIC) without and with secrecy constraints at receiver remains an open problem, even in the $K = 2$ user case, except for some special cases like strong/very strong interference regimes [6], [7]. The best known achievable region without any secrecy constraint for the 2-use GIC is given in [8]. The IC with $K \geq 2$ users and different eavesdropper settings have been analyzed in [9]–[13]. In [9], the broadcast and IC with independent confidential messages are considered and the achievable scheme is based on random binning techniques. For a special case of the IC, termed as the switch channel, optimality is established. The work in [10] demonstrates that with the help of an independent interferer, the secrecy capacity region of the wiretap channel can be enhanced. Also, outer bounds on the secrecy capacity of the wiretap

channel with a helping interferer are given for both discrete memoryless and Gaussian channels. The IC with different eavesdropper settings can be found in [11]–[13].

The effect of cooperation on secrecy has been explored in [14]–[16]. In [14], the effects of user cooperation on the secrecy of multiple access channel with generalized feedback is analyzed, where the message of each sender needs to be kept secret from each other. In [15], the effects of user cooperation on the secrecy of BC, where the receivers can cooperate with each other is considered. The achievable scheme uses a combination of Marton's coding scheme for BC and a compress and forward scheme for the relay channel. Also, outer bounds on the rate-equivocation region are presented. The role of relay in ensuring secrecy in case of different wireless networks can be found in [17]–[19].

A linear deterministic model for relay network was introduced in [20], which led to insights on the achievable schemes in Gaussian relay networks. The deterministic model has subsequently been used for studying the achievable rates with the secrecy constraints in [21]–[23]. In [21], secret communication over the IC is analyzed with different types of secrecy constraints: in the first case, the secrecy constraint is specific to the agreed-upon signaling strategy, and in the second case, the secrecy constraint takes into account the fact that the other users may deviate from the agreed-upon strategy. For a specific case of deterministic IC, the capacity region with these secrecy constraints are compared. The deterministic model has also studied under different eavesdropper settings in [22]–[24]. However, the role of limited transmitter-side cooperation on secrecy in an IC has not been explored in literature, and is the focus of this work.

In this work, the 2-user Gaussian symmetric IC (GSIC) with rate-limited transmitter cooperation is studied, to investigate the role of cooperation in managing interference and ensuring secrecy. Due to the cooperation between the transmitters and the secrecy constraints at the receivers, the encoding at the transmitter becomes complex and even deriving outer bounds become difficult. In order to make headway into this problem, first, the related problem of the linear deterministic setting is considered. For the symmetric linear deterministic IC (SLDIC) with cooperating transmitters and secrecy constraints at the receivers, achievable schemes and outer bounds on the secrecy rate are derived. This gives useful insights for the achievable schemes and outer bounds in the Gaussian setting. The proposed transmission/coding strategy in the

Gaussian setting is a superposition of a non-cooperative private codeword and a cooperative private codeword. For the non-cooperative private part, stochastic encoding is used citewyner-bell-1975, and for the cooperative private part, Marton's coding scheme is used [25], [26]. The auxiliary codewords corresponding to the cooperate private part is chosen such that the interference caused by the cooperative private auxiliary codeword of the other user is completely canceled out. This approach is in contrast to the one used in [26], where the interference caused by the unwanted auxiliary codeword is canceled approximately. Further, one of the users transmits dummy information. The major contributions of the work are as follows:

1) The proposed achievable scheme for the SLDIC is based on linear precoding, and uses a combination of interference cancelation, relaying of the other user's data bits, time sharing, and transmission of random bits, depending on the rate of the cooperative link and the relative strengths of the signal and the interference. The details of the achievable scheme can be found in Section IV.
2) For the SLDIC, outer bounds on the secrecy rate are derived, under different assumptions of providing side information to receivers and splitting the encoded message/output depending on the relative strength of the signal and the interference. The outer bounds are stated as Theorem 1-4.
3) Using the intuition gained from the SLDIC, an achievable scheme for the weak/moderate interference regime in the Gaussian case is proposed, which uses a combination of stochastic encoding and Marton's coding scheme. Also, to increase the achievable secrecy rate, one of the users transmits dummy information. The achievable secrecy rate results are given in Theorem 5 and Corollary 1.
4) For the high/very high interference regime, the proposed achievable scheme uses a combination of stochastic encoding and Marton's coding scheme. In contrast to the achievable scheme for the weak/moderate interference regime, without the help of dummy information sent by one of the transmitter, it is not possible to ensure secrecy for the non-cooperative part of the message in the high/very high interference regime. The achievable secrecy rate results are given in Theorem 6 and Corollary 2.
5) The outer bounds proposed for the SLDIC are extended to the Gaussian setting and are



Fig. 1. (a) GSIC and (b) SLDIC with transmitter cooperation

stated as Theorem 7-9. In some of the cases, it is not possible to partition the encoded message or output as done in case of SLDIC, and, hence, the side-information provided to the receivers is modified to get tight outer bounds.

It is shown that it is possible to achieve a nonzero secrecy rate in almost all cases, with limited transmitter cooperation. In case of SLDIC, the achievable secrecy rate equals the capacity of the same system without the secrecy constraints in some cases. Thus, the proposed schemes allow one to get secure communications for free, in these cases. It is also observed that the proposed outer bounds with cooperation are tighter than the existing outer bound without the secrecy constraint [26] in all interference regimes, except for the weak interference regime.

II. System Model

Consider a 2-user Gaussian symmetric IC (GSIC) with cooperating transmitters. The signals at the receivers are modeled as

$$y_1 = h_d x_1 + h_c x_2 + z_1; \quad y_2 = h_d x_2 + h_c x_1 + z_2, \tag{1}$$

where z_j $(j = 1, 2)$ is complex Gaussian, distributed as $z_j \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. Here, h_d and h_c are the channel gains of the direct and cross links, respectively. The transmitters cooperate through a noiseless link of finite rate (C_G). The equivalent deterministic model of (1) at high SNR is as

follows [26]:

$$\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{D}^{q-m}\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{D}^{q-n}\mathbf{x}_2;\ \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{D}^{q-m}\mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{D}^{q-n}\mathbf{x}_1, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{y}_i$ are binary vectors of length $q \triangleq \max\{m, n\}$, $\mathbf{D}$ is a $q \times q$ downshift matrix with elements $d_{j',j''} = 1$ if $2 \leq j' = j'' + 1 \leq q$ and $d_{j',j''} = 0$ otherwise, and $\oplus$ stands for modulo-2 addition (XOR operation). The parameters m and n are related to the GSIC as $m = (\lfloor \log |h_d|^2 \rfloor)^+$, $n = (\lfloor \log |h_c|^2 \rfloor)^+$, while the capacity of the cooperative link is $C = \lfloor C_G \rfloor$. The quantity $\alpha \triangleq \frac{n}{m}$ captures the amount of coupling between the signal and the interference, and is central to characterizing the achievable rates of the LDIC. The schematic representation of the GSIC and LDIC with transmitter cooperation is shown in Fig. 1.

The convention followed for denoting the bits transmitted over the LDIC is the same as that presented in [26]. The bits $a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{F}_2$ denote the information bits of transmitters 1 and 2, respectively, sent on the i^{th} level, with the levels numbered starting from the bottom-most entry. The bits transmitted on the different levels of LDIC are chosen to be equiprobable Bernoulli distributed, denoted $\mathrm{Bern}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$.

The transmitter i has a message W_i, which should be decodable at the intended receiver i, but needs to be kept secret from the other, unintended receiver j, $j \neq i$, in case of SLDIC and GSIC. In case of SLDIC, the encoded message is a function of its own data bits, the bits received through the cooperative link, and possibly some random data bits. The encoding at the transmitter should satisfy the causality constraint, i.e., it cannot depend on future cooperative bits. The decoding is based on solving the linear equation in (2) at each receiver. For secrecy, it is required to satisfy $I(W_i, \mathbf{y}_j) = 0, i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $i \neq j$ [3] in case of SLDIC. The details of the encoding and decoding scheme for the Gaussian case can be found in Section V and VI. In contrast to the SLDIC, notion of weak secrecy is considered for the Gaussian case. Also, it is assumed that the transmitters trust each other completely and that they do not deviate from the agreed scheme, for both the models.

III. SLDIC: Outer Bounds

In this section, four outer bounds on the symmetric rate for the 2-user SLDIC with limited-rate cooperation between transmitters and perfect secrecy constraints at the receivers are stated as

Theorems 1-4. The derivation of the outer bound involves use of Fano's inequality, providing side information to receivers in a carefully chosen manner, and the use of the secrecy constraints at receivers. Also, the following relation helps to establish these outer bounds: given the cooperating signals denoted by $(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N)$, the encoded messages and messages at the two transmitters are independent [26], [27]:

$$(W_1, \mathbf{x}_1^N) - (\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) - (W_2, \mathbf{x}_2^N). \tag{3}$$

Finally, the overall outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate is obtained by taking the minimum of these outer bounds depending on the value of α and the maximum possible rate, i.e., $\max(m,n)\mathbf{1}_{\{C>0\}} + \min(m,n)\mathbf{1}_{\{C=0\}}$ per user, where $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator function, equal to 1 if A is true, and equal to 0 otherwise.

In the derivation of the first outer bound, the encoded message $\mathbf{x}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ is divided into two parts: one part ($\mathbf{x}_{ia}$) which causes interference to the unintended receiver and another part ($\mathbf{x}_{ib}$) which is not received at the unintended receiver. Splitting the message in this way helps to obtain an outer bound on $2R_1 + R_2$, which leads to an outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate. The following theorem gives the outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate.

Theorem 1: The symmetric rate of the 2-user SLDIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers is upper bounded as:

$$R_s \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3}\left[2C + 3m - 2n\right] & \text{for } m \geq n \\ \frac{1}{3}\left[2C + n\right] & \text{for } m \leq n. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Proof: The proof is provided in the Appendix A. ■

In the derivation of the Theorem 2, the encoded message $\mathbf{x}_i\,(i = 1, 2)$ at each transmitter is split into three parts, as shown in Fig. 2(a). The splitting is based on whether the bits are received with interference or not at the intended receiver and whether or not they are received cleanly at the unintended receiver. In order to motivate the development of the following outer bound, first consider the $C = 0$ case. If receiver 1 can decode $\mathbf{x}_{1a}$ sent by transmitter 1, then receiver 2 can decode $\mathbf{x}_{1a}$ as well, since it gets these data bits without any interference. Hence, it is not possible to send any data bits securely on those levels. In order to exploit this, the receiver 1 is provided with the part of the signal sent by transmitter 1 that is received cleanly at receiver 2, i.e.,



(a) (b)

Fig. 2. (a) SLDIC with $m = 2$ and $n = 6$ and (b) SLDIC with $m = 3$ and $n = 5$: Illustration of splitting of the message/output.

$\mathbf{y}_{2a}^N \triangleq (\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N)$. Then, by using the secrecy constraint for the receiver 2, it is possible to bound the rate of user 1 by $I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N)$. When $\alpha \geq 2$, it is possible to show that $I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) = 0$. When $C > 0$, by using the above mentioned approach and the relation in (3), outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate is derived for $\alpha \geq 2$ and stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2: In the very high interference regime, i.e., for $\alpha \geq 2$, the symmetric rate of the 2-user SLDIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers is upper bounded as: $R_s \leq 2C$.

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix B. ■

The derivation of the outer bound in the Theorem 3 involves splitting of the output and the encoded message based on whether it is received with interference at the intended receiver, or causes interference to the other receiver as shown in Fig. 2(b). The outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate for the high interference regime is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 3: In the high interference regime, i.e., for $1 < \alpha < 2$, the symmetric rate of the 2-user SLDIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers is upper bounded as: $R \leq 2C + 2m - n$.

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix C. ■

The following theorem gives the outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate for the $\alpha = 1$ case. In this case, both the receivers see the same signal. Hence, it is possible for the receiver 2 decode

any message that receiver 1 is able to decode, and vice-versa. Therefore, it is not possible to achieve a nonzero secrecy rate, irrespective of C.

Theorem 4: When $\alpha = 1$, the symmetric rate of the 2-user SLDIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers is upper bounded as: $R_s = 0$.

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix D. ■

IV. SLDIC: Achievable Schemes

A. Weak/Moderate interference regime $(0 \leq \alpha < 1)$:

In this regime, the proposed scheme uses interference cancelation along with the transmission of random bits. In this case, bits transmitted on the lower $m-n$ levels $[1 : m-n]$ do not cause interference at the unintended receiver, and data bits transmitted on these levels will remain secure. Without transmitter cooperation, it is thus possible to transmit $m-n$ bits securely. Depending on the value of C and α, with the help of transmission of random bits, it is possible to send data bits on the higher levels $[m-n+1 : m]$ by carefully placing data bits along with zero bits and random bits. The proposed scheme achieves the following symmetric secrecy rate:

$$R_s = m - n + B(m-n) + q + \min\{n, C\}. \tag{5}$$

where $B \triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{g}{3(m-n)} \right\rfloor$, $g \triangleq \{n - (r_2 + C)\}^+$, $r_2 \triangleq m-n$, $q \triangleq \min\{(t-r_2)^+, r_2\}$ and $t \triangleq g\%\{3(m-n)\}$. The details of the encoding scheme can be found in Appendix E.

B. Interference is as strong as the signal $(\alpha = 1)$:

In this case, it is not possible to achieve a nonzero secrecy rate. Also, the outer bound in Theorem 4 establishes the same fact.

C. High interference regime $(1 < \alpha < 2)$

The achievable scheme is the same as that proposed for moderate interference regime, but it differs in the way the message at each transmitter is encoded. It uses transmission of random bits, interference cancelation, or both, depending on the capacity of the cooperative link. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate.

1) When $(1 < \alpha \leq 1.5)$:

$$R_s = B(n-m) + C + q, \tag{6}$$

where $B \triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{g}{3r_2} \right\rfloor$, $g \triangleq (m-C)^+$, $q = \min\{(t-r_2)^+, r_2\}$, $t \triangleq g\%\{3r_2\}$ and $r_2 \triangleq n-m$.

2) When $(1.5 < \alpha < 2)$:

$$R_s = \begin{cases} 2m-n+C & \text{for } 0 \leq C \leq 4n-6m \\ 4n-6m+C_{T_1}+C_{T_2}+C_{T_3}+r_d & \text{for } 4n-6m < C \leq n, \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

where $C_{T_1} \triangleq \min\left\{\left\lceil \frac{C_{\text{rem}}}{2} \right\rceil, 2m-n\right\}$, $C_{\text{rem}} \triangleq (C'-C_{T_3})^+$, $C_{T_3} \triangleq \min\{2m-n, C''\}$, $C' \triangleq C-(4n-6m)$, $C'' \triangleq \left\lceil \frac{C'}{3} \right\rceil$, $C_{T_2} \triangleq \min\{2m-n, (C_{\text{rem}}-C_{T_1})^+\}$ and $r_d \triangleq \min\{(2m-n-C_{T_3})^+, 2m-n-C_{T_2}\}$.

The details of the encoding scheme and some illustrative examples can be found in Appendix F.

D. Very high interference regime $(\alpha \geq 2)$*:*

In this case, when $C = 0$, it is not possible to achieve nonzero secrecy rate. Also, the outer bound in Theorem 2 establishes this fact. However, with cooperation, it is possible to achieve nonzero secrecy rate. In this case, the proposed scheme uses interference cancelation, time sharing, and the transmitters exchange data bits, random bits, or both, depending on the capacity of the cooperative link. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate.

1) When m is even:

$$R_s = \begin{cases} 2C & \text{for } 0 < C \leq \frac{m}{2} \\ \frac{m}{2}+C & \text{for } \frac{m}{2} < C \leq n-\frac{3m}{2} \\ \frac{n}{2}-\frac{m}{4}+\frac{C}{2} & \text{for } n-\frac{3m}{2} < C < n-\frac{m}{2} \\ \min\{n, C\} & \text{for } n-\frac{m}{2} \leq C \leq n. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

2) When m is odd:

$$R_s = \begin{cases} \min\{2C, m\} & \text{for } 0 < C \leq \frac{m+1}{2} \\ m+\min\left\{C-\frac{m+1}{2}, n-2m\right\} & \text{for } \frac{m+1}{2} < C \leq \frac{2n-3m+1}{2} \\ n-2m+\frac{1}{2}\left[C_1^{ul}+2C_1^{uu}+C_2^{uu}+C_1^{lu}+C_2^{ul}\right] & \text{for } \frac{2n-3m+1}{2} < C \leq n, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where $C_1^{uu} \triangleq \left\lceil \frac{C}{2} \right\rceil$, $C_1^{ul} \triangleq (m-C_1^{uu})^+$, $C_2^{uu} \triangleq (C-C_2^{lu}-C_2^r)^+$, $C_1^{lu} \triangleq (C-C_1^{uu}-C_1^r)^+$, $C_2^{ul} \triangleq C_1^{ll}$, $C_1^{ll} = \min\{2C_1^r, (m-C_1^{lu})^+)\}$, $C_2^{ll} = C_1^{ul}$ and $C_2^r \triangleq \max\left\{\left\lceil \frac{C_2^{ll}}{2} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{C_2^{ul}}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$, $C_1^r = \left\lceil \frac{C_1^{ul}}{2} \right\rceil$. The details of the achievable scheme, and some examples, can be found in Appendix G.

V. GSIC: Achievable Scheme for the Weak/Moderate Interference Regime ($0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2}{3}$ and $\frac{2}{3} < \alpha \leq 1$)

In this section, the achievable secrecy rate is derived for the GSIC using a combination of Marton's coding scheme and stochastic encoding. The achievable scheme is based on the approach proposed in Section IV-A in the weak and moderate interference regime, for the SLDIC. In case of SLDIC, the achievable scheme uses a combination of interference cancelation, transmission of random bits, or both, depending on the value of α and C. That scheme is extended to the Gaussian setting as follows.

The message at transmitter i is split into two parts: a non-cooperative private (w_{pi}) part and a cooperative private (w_{cpi}) part. The non-cooperative private message is encoded using stochastic encoding [4], and the cooperative private part is encoded using Marton's coding scheme [25], [26]. In case of SLDIC, data bits transmitted at the lower levels $[1 : m-n]$ are not received at the unintended receiver. Hence, these data bits remain secure. But, in the Gaussian setting, it is not possible to transmit in this manner. Hence, for the non-cooperative private part, stochastic encoding is used to ensure secrecy. The transmitter encodes the non-cooperative part $w_{pi} \in \mathcal{W}_{pi} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR_{pi}}\}$ into $\mathbf{x}_{pi}^N$. A stochastic encoder is specified by a matrix of conditional probability $f_{pi}(x_{pi,k}|w_{pi})$ $(i = 1, 2)$, where $x_{pi} \in \mathcal{X}_{pi}$ and $w_{pi} \in \mathcal{W}_{pi}$ and it satisfies the following condition.

$$\sum_{x_{pi,k}} f_{pi}(x_{pi,k}|w_{pi}) = 1, \qquad k = 1, 2, \ldots, N, \tag{10}$$

where $f_{pi}(x_{pi,k}|w_{pi})$ is the probability that $x_{pi,k}$ is output by the stochastic encoder, when message w_{pi} was sent.

The cooperative private message $w_{cp1} \in \mathcal{W}_{cp1} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR_{cp1}}\}$ and $w_{cp2} \in \mathcal{W}_{cp2} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR_{cp2}}\}$ at transmitters 1 and 2 are encoded using Marton's coding scheme, where the encoding is done in such a way that the interference caused by the non-intended cooperative private part is completely canceled at the non-intended receiver. The transmitter 2 sends a dummy message along with the cooperative private message and the non-cooperative private message. The additional dummy message sent by the transmitter 2 can enhance the achievable secrecy rate depending on the value of α and C.

A. Encoding and Decoding

Transmitter i $(i = 1, 2)$ generates $2^{N(R_{pi}+R'_{pi})}$ i.i.d. sequences of length N at random according to

$$P(\mathbf{x}_{pi}^N) = \prod_{k=1}^{N} P(x_{pi,k}). \tag{11}$$

The $2^{N(R_{pi}+R'_{pi})}$ codewords in codebook C_{pi} are randomly grouped into $2^{NR_{pi}}$ bins, with each bin containing $2^{NR'_{pi}}$ codewords. Any codeword in C_{pi} is indexed as $\mathbf{x}_{pi}^N(w_{pi}, w'_{pi})$ for $w_{pi} \in \mathcal{W}_{pi}$ and $w'_{pi} \in \mathcal{W}'_{pi} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR'_{pi}}\}$. In order to transmit w_{pi}, transmitter i selects $w'_{pi} \in \mathcal{W}'_{pi}$ randomly and selects the codeword $\mathbf{x}_{pj}^N(w_{pi}, w'_{pi})$.

In order to transmit a dummy message, transmitter 2 generates $2^{NR_{d2}}$ i.i.d. sequences of length N at random according to

$$P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) = \prod_{k=1}^{N} P(x_{d2,k}). \tag{12}$$

The $2^{NR_{d2}}$ codewords in codebook C_{d2} are randomly grouped into $2^{NR'_{d2}}$ bins with each bin containing $2^{NR''_{d2}}$ codewords. Any codeword in C_{d2} is indexed as $\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(w'_{d2}, w''_{d2})$, where $w'_{d2} \in \mathcal{W}'_{d2} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR'_{d2}}\}$ and $w''_{d2} \in W''_{d2} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR''_{d2}}\}$. During encoding, transmitter 2 selects $w'_{d2} \in \mathcal{W}'_{d2}$ and $w''_{d2} \in \mathcal{W}''_{d2}$ independently at random and sends the codeword $\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(w'_{d2}, w''_{d2})$.

For the cooperative private message, generate the cooperative private vector codeword $\mathbf{x}_{cp}^N(w_{cp1}, w_{cp2})$ based on Marton's coding scheme according to

$$P(\mathbf{x}_{cp}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) = \prod_{k=1}^{N} P(\mathbf{x}_{cp,k}, u_{1,k}, u_{2,k}), \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_1^N(\widetilde{w}_{cp1})$ and $\mathbf{u}_2^N(\widetilde{w}_{cp2})$ are auxiliary codewords. The choice of these codewords are discussed in the proof of Theorem 5. Finally, superimpose the non-cooperative private codeword and cooperative private codeword to form the transmit codeword at the transmitter 1 and superimpose the non-cooperative private codeword, cooperative private codeword and the dummy message codeword to form the transmit codeword at the transmitter 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1^N(w_{cp1}, w_{cp2}, w_{p1}, w'_{p1}) &= \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}^N[1] + \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \\ \text{and } \mathbf{x}_2^N(w_{cp1}, w_{cp2}, w_{p2}, w'_{p2}, w'_{d2}, w''_{d2}) &= \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}^N[2] + \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N + \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

For decoding, receiver i looks for a unique message tuple such that $(\mathbf{y}_i^N, \mathbf{u}_i^N(\hat{\widetilde{w}}_{cpi}),$ $\mathbf{x}_{pi}^N(\hat{w}_{pi}, \hat{w}'_{pi}))$ is jointly typical. Based on the above coding strategy, the following theorem gives the achievable result on the secrecy rate.

Theorem 5: In the weak/moderate interference regime, the following rate is achievable for the GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers:

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 + R'_{p1} &\leq I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1), \\ R_1 + R'_{p1} &\leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_1) + \min\left\{C, I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{x}_{p1})\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $R'_{p1} = I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2)$. The achievable secrecy rate for the user 2 can be obtained by changing the index from 1 to 2 in (15).

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix H. ■

Using the achievable result in Theorem 5 and time-sharing, the achievable *symmetric* secrecy rate is stated in the following Corollary.

Corollary 1: Using the proposed scheme in Theorem 5 and time-sharing between transmitters, following symmetric secrecy rate is achievable for the real GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation:

$$R_s = \frac{1}{2}\left[R_i^*(1) + R_i^*(2)\right], \tag{16}$$

where $i = 1, 2$ and $R_i^*(1)$ and $R_i^*(2)$ are the achievable secrecy rate for the transmitter i in the first and second time slot, respectively, which is obtained by maximizing the rate given in the following equations:

$$R_1(1) \leq \begin{cases} 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_u^2 + h_d^2 P_{p1}}{1 + h_c^2 P_{d2} + h_c^2 P_{p2}}\right) - R'_{p1}, \\ 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{h_d^2 P_{p1}}{1 + h_c^2 P_{d2} + h_c^2 P_{p2}}\right) + \min\left\{C, 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_u^2}{1 + h_c^2 P_{d2} + h_c^2 P_{p2}}\right)\right\} - R'_{p1}, \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

$$R_2(1) \leq \begin{cases} 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_u^2 + h_d^2 P_{p2}}{1 + h_d^2 P_{d2} + h_c^2 P_{p1}}\right) - R'_{p2}, \\ 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{h_d^2 P_{p2}}{1 + h_d^2 P_{d2} + h_c^2 P_{p1}}\right) + \min\left\{C, 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_u^2}{1 + h_d^2 P_{d2} + h_c^2 P_{p1}}\right)\right\} - R'_{p2}, \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

where $R'_{p1} = 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{h_c^2 P_{p1}}{1 + h_d^2 P_{d2}}\right)$, $R'_{p2} = 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{h_c^2 P_{p2}}{1 + h_c^2 P_{d2}}\right)$, $\sigma_u^2 \triangleq (h_d^2 - h_c^2)^2\sigma_z^2$, $\sigma_z^2 \triangleq \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_1 + \theta_2}\frac{P_1}{h_d^2 + h_c^2}$, $P_{p1} \triangleq \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1 + \theta_2}P_1$, $P_{p2} = \frac{\eta_1}{\eta_1 + \eta_2}P'$, $P_{d2} = \frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1 + \eta_2}P'$, $P' = (P_2 - (h_d^2 + h_c^2)\sigma_z^2)$, $P_i \triangleq \beta P$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and $0 \leq (\theta_i, \eta_i, \beta) \leq 1$. The rate equation for the second time slot can be obtained by changing the index from 1 to 2 and vice-versa in (17) and (18).

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix I. ■

VI. GSIC: Achievable Scheme for the High/Very High Interference Regime ($\alpha > 1$)

In this section, the achievable secrecy rate is derived using a combination of Marton's coding scheme and stochastic encoding. The achievable scheme is based on the approach used for obtaining the achievable scheme for the SLDIC in case of high interference regime. The achievable scheme proposed for the SLDIC in Section IV-C used a combination of interference cancelation, relaying of the other user's data bits, and transmission of random bits. In case of SLDIC, as some of the interfering links are not present to the intended receiver, the levels corresponding to these links can be directly used for other user's data transmission. But, in the Gaussian setting, it is not possible to relay other user's data directly in this manner. Hence, the proposed scheme uses a combination of interference cancelation and stochastic encoding, along with dummy message transmission.

The message of transmitter 1 is split into non-cooperative private message (w_{p1}) and cooperative private message (w_{cp1}). The second transmitter sends cooperative private message (w_{cp2}) along with dummy message (w_{d2}). In contrast to the deterministic model, the non-cooperative private message at transmitter 1 is encoded using stochastic encoding [4]. The transmitter encodes the non-cooperative part $w_{p1} \in \mathcal{W}_{p1} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR_{p1}}\}$ into $\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N$.

The cooperative private message $w_{cp1} \in \mathcal{W}_{cp1} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR_{cp1}}\}$ and $w_{cp2} \in \mathcal{W}_{cp2} = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{NR_{cp2}}\}$ at transmitters 1 and 2 are encoded using Marton's coding scheme, where the encoding is done in such a way that the interference caused by the non-intended cooperative private part is completely canceled at the non-intended receiver [25], [26]. Transmitter 2 sends a dummy message along with the cooperative private message. In order to send the dummy message, the second transmitter sends $\mathbf{x}_{d2}$ randomly and can be considered as using another stochastic encoder f_{d2}, which is specified by a matrix of probability $f_{d2}(x_{d2,k})$, with $x_{d2,k} \in \mathcal{X}_{d2}$ and $\sum_{x_{d2,k}} f_{d2}(x_{d2,k}) = 1$. The rate of the dummy message is chosen such that the non-cooperative private message sent by transmitter 1 remains secure at receiver 2, and transmitter 1 is able to decode the dummy message. In this case, without the dummy message, it is not possible to

ensure secrecy for the non-cooperative private message of transmitter 1. Finally, at transmitter 1, the cooperative private message and the non-cooperative private message are superimposed to form the transmit codeword $(\mathbf{x}_1^N)$ and at the transmitter 2, the cooperative private message and the dummy information are superimposed to form the transmit codeword $(\mathbf{x}_2^N)$.

A. Encoding and Decoding

The encoding for the non-cooperative private message at transmitter 1 and cooperative private message at both the transmitters are the same as described in Section V-A. In order to transmit the dummy message, transmitter 2 chooses $\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(w_{d2})$ for $w_{d2} \in \mathcal{W}_{d2}$.

Finally, the non-cooperative private and cooperative private codewords are superimposed to form the transmit codeword at the transmitter 1 and the cooperative private and dummy codewords are superimposed to form the transmit codeword at the transmitter 2:

$$\mathbf{x}_1^N(w_{cp1}, w_{cp2}, w_{p1}, w'_{p1}) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}^N[1] + \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_2^N(w_{cp1}, w_{cp2}, w_{d2}) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}^N[2] + \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N. \tag{19}$$

For decoding, receiver 1 looks for a unique message tuple such that $(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N(\hat{\widetilde{w}}_{cp1}),$ $\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N(\hat{w}_{p1}, \hat{w}'_{p1}), \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(\hat{w}_{d2}))$ is jointly typical. Receiver 2 looks for a index $\hat{w}_{cp2}$ such that $(\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N(\hat{\widetilde{w}}_{cp2}))$ is jointly typical.

Based on the above coding strategy, the following theorem gives the achievable result on the secrecy rate.

Theorem 6: In the high interference regime, the following rate is achievable for the GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receivers:

$$\begin{aligned}
&R_1 + R'_{p1} \leq \min\left[I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{x}_{d2}), I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}) + \min\left\{I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}), C\right\}\right],\\
&R_1 + R'_{p1} + R_{d2} \leq \min\left[I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1), I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_1) + \min\left\{I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}), C\right\},\right.\\
&\qquad\qquad \left. I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}) + I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{x}_{p1})\right],\\
&R_1 + R'_{p1} + 2R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_1) + I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{x}_{p1}),\\
&R_2 \leq \min\left\{I(\mathbf{u}_2; \mathbf{y}_2), C\right\},\\
&R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $R_1 \triangleq R_{p1}+R_{cp1}$, $R_2 \triangleq R_{cp2}$ and R'_{p1} and R_{d2} are set as $I(\mathbf{x}_{p1};\mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{u}_2)$ and $I(\mathbf{x}_{d2};\mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{x}_{p1},\mathbf{u}_2)$, respectively.

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix J. ■

Using the achievable result in Theorem 6 and time-sharing, the achievable symmetric secrecy rate is stated in the following Corollary.

Corollary 2: Using the scheme proposed in Theorem 6 and time-sharing between transmitters, following symmetric secrecy rate is achievable for the GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation.

$$R_s = \frac{1}{2}\left[R_i^*(1) + R_i^*(2)\right], \tag{21}$$

where $i = 1, 2$ and $R_i^*(1)$ and $R_i^*(2)$ are the achievable secrecy rates for the transmitter i in the first and second time slot, respectively, and are obtained by maximizing the rate given in the following equations:

$$R_1(1) \leq \begin{cases} \min\left[0.5\log(1+\sigma_u^2+h_d^2P_{p1}), 0.5\log(1+h_d^2P_{p1}) + \min\left\{0.5\log(1+\sigma_u^2), C\right\}\right] - R'_{p1}, \\ \min\left[0.5\log(1+\sigma_u^2+h_d^2P_{p1}+h_c^2P_{d2}), 0.5\log(1+\sigma_u^2+h_c^2P_{d2}) + \right. \\ \quad \left. \min\left\{0.5\log(1+\sigma_u^2), C\right\}, 0.5\left\{\log(1+h_d^2P_{p1}) + \log(1+\sigma_u^2+h_c^2P_{d2})\right\}\right] \\ \qquad -(R'_{p1}+R_{d2}), \\ 0.5\log(1+h_d^2P_{p1}+h_c^2P_{d2}) + 0.5\log(1+\sigma_u^2+h_c^2P_{d2}) - (R'_{p1}+2R_{d2}) \end{cases}$$

and $R_2(1) = \min\left\{0.5\log\left(1+\dfrac{\sigma_u^2}{1+h_d^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p1}}\right), C\right\}$, (22)

where $R'_{p1} = 0.5\log\left(1+\frac{h_c^2P_{p1}}{1+h_d^2P_{d2}}\right)$, $R_{d2} = 0.5\log(1+h_d^2P_{d2})$, $\sigma_u^2 \triangleq (h_d^2-h_c^2)^2\sigma_z^2$, $\sigma_z^2 \triangleq \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_1+\theta_2}\frac{P_1}{h_d^2+h_c^2}$, $P_{p1} \triangleq \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1+\theta_2}P_1$, $P_{d2} \triangleq (P_2-(h_d^2+h_c^2)\sigma_z^2)^+$, $P_i \triangleq \beta P$ and $0 \leq (\theta_i, \beta) \leq 1$. The rate equation for the second time slot can be obtained by changing the index from 1 to 2 and vice-versa in (22).

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix K. ■

Lemma 1:

$$I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) \leq N\left[I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2) + \epsilon_3\right], \tag{23}$$

where ϵ_3 is small for sufficiently large N.

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix L. ■

VII. GSIC: Outer Bounds

In this section, the outer bounds on the secrecy rate for the GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation are stated as Theorems 7-9. The outer bounds presented in Theorem 7-9 are related to the techniques used to derive outer bounds on the secrecy rate in case of SLDIC. In deriving these outer bounds, the difficulty lies in translating the ideas from the SLDIC to the Gaussian case. The outer bound derived on the secrecy rate in case of SLDIC in Theorem 1, splits the encoded message into two parts: $\mathbf{x}_{ia}^N$ (received at receiver $j \neq i$) and $\mathbf{x}_{ib}^N$ (not received at receiver $j \neq i$). In case of Gaussian setting, it is not possible to split the message in this way. Hence, in the derivation of Theorem 7, $\mathbf{s}_i^N = h_c \mathbf{x}_i^N + \mathbf{z}_j^N$ $(j \neq i)$ is used to imitate $\mathbf{x}_{ia}^N$. In this section, the following notation is used: SNR $\triangleq h_d^2 P$, INR $\triangleq h_c^2 P$ and $\rho \triangleq E[\mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{x}_2]$.

Theorem 7: The symmetric rate of the 2-user GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receiver is upper bounded as follows:

$$R_s \leq \max_{0 \leq |\rho| \leq 1} \frac{1}{3} \left[2C + 0.5 \log \left(1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho \sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} \right) + 0.5 \log \det \left(\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \right) \right], \quad (24)$$

where $\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}} = \Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}} - \Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}},\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}^{-1} \Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}},\bar{\mathbf{s}}}^T$, det(.) represents determinant of a matrix,

$$\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} & 2\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} + \rho(\text{SNR} + \text{INR}) \\ 2\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} + \rho(\text{SNR} + \text{INR}) & 1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}},\bar{\mathbf{s}}} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} + \rho\text{INR} & \text{INR} + \rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} \\ \text{INR} + \rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} & \sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} + \rho\text{INR} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } \Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \text{INR} & \rho\text{INR} \\ \rho\text{INR} & 1 + \text{INR} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix M. ■

The outer bound on the secrecy rate presented in the following theorem uses the idea used in deriving outer bound in Theorems 2 and 3 in case of SLDIC. But, in the Gaussian setting, it is not possible to split the encoded message as was done in case of SLDIC. For example, in Theorem 2, a part of the output at receiver 2 which does not contain any signal transmitted by transmitter 1 is provided as side information to receiver 1. Hence, the approach used in the derivation of the outer bound in case of SLDIC cannot be directly extended for the Gaussian case. In the Gaussian case, $\mathbf{x}_2^N$ is provided as side information to receiver 1, and this eliminates the

interference caused by transmitter 2. Then, the receiver 1 is provided with $\mathbf{y}_2^N$ as side-information to receiver 1. The outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 8: The symmetric rate of the 2-user GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receiver is upper bounded as follows.

$$R_s \leq \max_{0\leq|\rho|\leq 1} \left[2C + 0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{\text{SNR} + \text{SNR}^2(1-\rho^2)}{1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}}\right)\right], \tag{25}$$

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix N. ■

The outer bound presented in the following theorem is similar to the outer bound presented in Theorem 4 in case of SLDIC. This kind of outer bound exists in the literature (see, for example, [23]), but for the sake of completeness, it is presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 9: The symmetric rate of the 2-user GSIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation and secrecy constraints at the receiver is upper bounded as follows.

$$R_s \leq \max_{0\leq|\rho|\leq 1} 0.5\log\left[1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} - \frac{(2\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} + \rho(\text{SNR} + \text{INR}))^2}{1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}}\right]. \tag{26}$$

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix O. ■

VIII. Results and Discussion

In this section, some numerical examples are considered for the deterministic and Gaussian cases, to get insights into the bounds over different interference regimes.

A. Numerical Examples in Case of SLDIC

In Figs. 7 and 8, the outer bound on the secrecy rate per user obtained in Section III is plotted against the capacity of the cooperative link for different values of m and n. Also plotted is the per user capacity of the SLDIC with transmitter cooperation, but without the secrecy constraints [26] and the achievable secrecy rate derived in Section IV.

In Fig. 7, the outer bound in Theorem 1 is plotted for the $(m, n) = (5, 4)$ case. When $C = 1$, the achievable scheme in Section IV meets the proposed outer bound in Section III. From the

figure, it can be observed that due to secrecy constraint, it is not possible to achieve the capacity without the secrecy constraint, when $C \leq 3$.

In Fig. 8, the minimum of the outer bounds in Theorems 1 and 2 is plotted as a function of C, with $(m, n) = (3, 6)$. In this case, the outer bound in Theorem 2 is active when $0 \leq C \leq 1$, and the outer bound in Theorem 1 is active when $2 \leq C \leq 5$. From the plot, it can be observed that it is not possible to achieve a nonzero secrecy rate when $C = 0$. Also, the achievable scheme, which uses random bits sharing through the cooperative link and interference cancelation, is optimal for $C = 1$. There is a nonzero penalty in the achievable rate due to the secrecy constraint at the receivers, when $C \leq 5$.

In Figs. 9 and 10, the outer bound on the symmetric rate is plotted against α for a given value of C, along with the per user capacity of the SLDIC with transmitter cooperation, but without the secrecy constraints [26] and inner bounds for the SLDIC with secrecy constraints at the receiver. In order to generate these plots, m is chosen to be 400 and n is varied from 0 to $4m$, and the rates are normalized by m.

In Fig. 9, the achievable secrecy rate and the capacity without secrecy constraints in [26] match when $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$. When $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq \frac{2}{3}$, the achievable rate without the secrecy constraint increases with increase in the value of α, as the receivers are able to decode some part of the interference. However, with the secrecy constraint, the receiver cannot decode the other user's message, and hence, the achievable rate decreases with α. When $\frac{2}{3} < \alpha < 1$, the achievable secrecy rate meets the outer bound at some of the points and the fluctuating behavior of the achievable rate is due to the floor-operation involved in the rate expression. In this regime, the transmission of random bits help to compensate for the loss in rate, to some extent. At $\alpha = 1$, there exists a point of discontinuity, as no nonzero secrecy rate is achievable. In the high interference regime, $1 < \alpha < 2$, it is intuitive to think that the achievable secrecy rate should decrease with increase in the value of α. Interestingly, the achievable secrecy rate increases with increase in the value of α, when $1 < \alpha \leq 1.5$ although the increase is not monotonic in nature due to the floor operation involved in the rate expression. However, when $1.5 < \alpha < 2$, the achievable secrecy rate decreases with further increase in the value of α and the outer bound meets the inner bound. When $\alpha \geq 2$, it is no longer possible to achieve nonzero secrecy rate.

In Fig. 10, in the initial portion of the weak interference regime, the proposed scheme achieves the maximum possible rate. With further increase in the value of α, the achievable secrecy rate decreases, as C is not large enough to eliminate the interference completely. But, compared to the $C = 0$ case in Fig. 9, the achievable secrecy rate is higher in all the interference regimes due to the cooperation, except when $\alpha = 1$. Also, it is possible to achieve a nonzero optimal secrecy rate, even when $\alpha \geq 2$ and the achievable scheme is optimal.

B. Numerical Examples in Case of GSIC

First, the derived outer bound is compared with existing outer bounds for the GIC, when $C = 0$. From the Fig. 11, it can be observed that the proposed outer bound is tighter than the other existing outer bounds, depending on the value of α.

In Fig. 12, the achievable symmetric secrecy rate is plotted against α for $C = 0$ and $P = 100$. Also, plotted is the outer bound on the symmetric rate in case of GSIC without the secrecy constraint at receiver [26]. While plotting the outer bound with secrecy constraint, the minimum of outer bounds derived in this work and outer bounds in [10], [26], [28] is taken for the $C = 0$ case. When $(0 \leq \alpha \leq 1)$, the achievable secrecy rate decreases with increase in the value α. At $\alpha = 1$, the achievable secrecy rate becomes zero. But, with further increase in the value of α, the achievable secrecy rate increases, and at around $\alpha = 1.5$, the achievable secrecy rate decreases with further increase in the value of α. Also, there is a penalty in the achievable rate due to the secrecy constraint at receivers, except for the weak interference regime.

In Fig. 13, the achievable symmetric secrecy rate is plotted against α for $P = 100$ and $C = 1$, along with the outer bounds. For plotting the outer bound with secrecy constraints, the minimum of the outer bounds derived in this work and the outer bound in [26] is used. When $(0 \leq \alpha < 1)$, the achievable secrecy rate decreases with increase in the value of α, but the proposed scheme achieves higher rate compared to the $C = 0$ case. When $\alpha > 1$, the achievable secrecy rate increases in the initial part of high interference regime, then the achievable secrecy rate decreases in the later part of the high interference regime. Finally, the achievable secrecy rate saturates when $(\alpha \geq 2)$, and this is due to the fact that it is no longer possible to transmit any non-cooperative private message and the gain in the achievable secrecy rate as compared to

$C = 0$ case is due to cooperation only. Hence, the proposed scheme achieves nonzero secrecy rate in all the interference regimes except for the $\alpha = 1$ case.

In Fig. 14, the achievable symmetric secrecy rate is plotted against α for $P = 100$ and $C = 10$, along with the outer bounds. Here, the achievable secrecy rate and outer bounds are very close to each other.

C. Further Remarks

1) When $(0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2})$, the proposed achievable scheme is optimal for all values of C in the SLDIC. But, in the Gaussian case, there is a gap between the inner bound and outer bound.
2) When $(\frac{2}{3} < \alpha < 1)$, the proposed scheme achieves nonzero secrecy rate for all values of C in case of SLDIC and GSIC. For the deterministic case, it is possible to transmit data bits securely in the higher levels by intelligently choosing the placement of data and random bits, in addition to interference cancelation. In contrast to the deterministic case, only one of the users transmits dummy information in the Gaussian case.
3) When $(1 < \alpha < 2)$ and $C = 0$, it is not possible to ensure secrecy without transmission of random bits and dummy information transmission in case of SLDIC and GSIC, respectively.
4) In all the interference regimes, the proposed scheme always achieves nonzero secrecy rate with cooperation in case of SLDIC as well as GSIC, except for the $\alpha = 1$ case.
5) When $C = n$ and $\alpha \neq 1$, i.e., when the cooperative link is as strong as the strength of the interference, the proposed scheme achieves the maximum possible rate of $\max\{m, n\}$ in case of SLDIC. Also, in the Gaussian case, when $C \approx 0.5 \log(1 + h_c^2 P)$, the achievable secrecy rate is very close to the outer bound.
6) From the derived outer bounds, it is found that it is not possible to achieve the rate without the secrecy constraint except for the weak interference regime in case of SLDIC and GSIC, when C is not relatively large.
7) The outer bound in Theorem 2 for $\alpha \geq 2$ helps to establish that sharing random bits through the cooperative link can achieve the optimal rate when m is even (odd) and $0 < C \leq \frac{m}{2}$ $(0 < C < \frac{m+1}{2})$ in case of SLDIC.

IX. Conclusion

This work explored the role of limited-rate transmitter cooperation in facilitating secure communication over 2-user IC. For the deterministic case, the achievable scheme used a combination of interference cancelation, random bit transmission, relaying of the other user's data bits, and time sharing, depending on the values of α and C. Also, outer bounds on the secrecy rate were derived for the deterministic case. The novelty in the derivation of the outer bound lies in providing side information to receiver in a carefully chosen manner, use of the secrecy constraints at the receivers, and partitioning the encoded message/output, depending on the value of α. The study of the deterministic model gave useful insights for obtaining achievable schemes and outer bounds on the secrecy rate for the Gaussian case. The achievable scheme used a combination of Marton's coding scheme and stochastic encoding along with dummy information transmission. The derived bounds gave useful insights on the performance limits of the system. For example, it was found that, with cooperation, it is possible to achieve nonzero secrecy rate in almost all cases, except for the $\alpha = 1$ case.

Appendix

A. Proof of Theorem 1

Using Fano's inequality, the rate of user 1 is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&= H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_1^N|W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_1^N|W_1, \mathbf{x}_1^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&= H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N|W_1, \mathbf{x}_1^N) + N\epsilon_1, \text{ where, } \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N \triangleq \mathbf{D}^{q-n}\mathbf{x}_2^N, \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N|W_1, \mathbf{x}_1^N, \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
\text{or } H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) &\leq H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) - NR_1 + N\epsilon_1, \qquad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows by using the fact that the entropy cannot increase by additional conditioning and (b) follows by using the relation in (3).

Adopting similar steps used to obtain (27), the following bound on the conditional entropy is obtained.

$$H(\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) \leq H(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - NR_2 + N\epsilon_2, \text{ where, } \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N \triangleq \mathbf{D}^{q-n}\mathbf{x}_1^N. \tag{28}$$

The rate of user 1 can also be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} H(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} H(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N,\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N,\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} H(\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N,\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N,\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(f)}{\leq} H(\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N,\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N,\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N,\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N,\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where (a) is due to a genie providing $\mathbf{y}_2^N$ to receiver 1; (b) is due to the perfect secrecy condition at receiver 2, i.e., $I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_2^N) = 0$; (c) is obtained from the joint entropy $H(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) = H(\mathbf{y}_2^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N)$; (d), (e) and (f): follows from the chain rule for joint entropy; (f) is obtained using chain rule for joint entropy; and (g) is obtained using the fact that removing conditioning cannot decrease the entropy.

Using (27) and (28), (29) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) - N\left[R_1+R_2\right] + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N,\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
\text{or } N[2R_1+R_2] &\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) + H(\mathbf{D}^{q-m}\mathbf{x}_1^N|\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) + H(\mathbf{D}^{q-m}\mathbf{x}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

The above equation is simplified under the following cases.

Case 1 $(m \geq n)$: In this case $q = m$ and (30) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} N[2R_1 + R_2] &\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_1^N|\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\ \text{or } R &\leq \frac{1}{3}\left[2C + 3m - 2n\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The above equation is obtained by using the fact that the entropy $H(\mathbf{v}_{12}, \mathbf{v}_{21})$, $H(\mathbf{y}_i)$ and $H(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{x}_{ia})$ are upper bounded by $2C$, m and $m-n$, respectively.

Case 2 $(m \leq n)$: In this case $q = n$ and (30) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} N[2R_1 + R_2] &\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N) + H(\mathbf{D}^{n-m}\mathbf{x}_1^N|\mathbf{x}_1^N) + H(\mathbf{D}^{n-m}\mathbf{x}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\ \text{or } R &\leq \frac{1}{3}\left[2C + n\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The above equation is obtained by using the fact that the entropy $H(\mathbf{v}_{12}, \mathbf{v}_{21})$ and $H(\mathbf{y}_1)$ are upper bounded by $2C$ and n, respectively. Also, given $\mathbf{x}_i^N$, there is no uncertainty about $\mathbf{D}^{n-m}\mathbf{x}_i^N$. Combining (31) and (32) results in (4). This completes the proof.

B. Proof of Theorem 2

Using Fano's inequality, the rate of user 1 is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} NR_1 &\leq I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \text{ where } \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N \triangleq (\mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N), \\ &= I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) + I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where (a) is due to a genie providing $\mathbf{y}_{2a}^N$ to receiver 1. From the secrecy constraint at receiver 2, following holds.

$$\begin{aligned} & I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_2^N) = 0, \\ \text{or } & I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{2b}^N) = 0, \text{ where } \mathbf{y}_{2b}^N = \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N \oplus \mathbf{x}_{1c}^N, \\ \text{or } & I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) + I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_{2b}^N|\mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

As mutual information cannot be negative, $I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) = 0$ and (33) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&= H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2b}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N \oplus \mathbf{x}_{2c}^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2b}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N \oplus \mathbf{x}_{2c}^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&= H(\mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_2^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1b}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + N\epsilon_1,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{or } R_1 \leq 2C. \tag{35}$$

where (a) is obtained by splitting the message into three parts as shown in Fig. 2(a); (b) is due to the fact that conditioning cannot increase the entropy; (c) is due to the fact that removing conditioning cannot decrease the entropy; and (d) follows by using the relationship in (3). This completes the proof.

C. Proof of Theorem 3

Using Fano's inequality, rate of user 1 is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\leq I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_{2a}^N) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&= H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N | \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1,
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&= H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{2a}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, W_1) \\
&\qquad - H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \\
&= H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, W_1) + N\epsilon_1, \qquad (36)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, split $\mathbf{y}_{1b}$ in the following way:

- $\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)}$: contains $\mathbf{x}_{1a}$ along with part of $\mathbf{x}_2$
- $\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)}$: contains part of $\mathbf{x}_2$ along with part of $\mathbf{x}_1$ excluding $\mathbf{x}_{1a}$

Consider the second term in (36)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) \\
&= H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)N}, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) \\
&= H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)N}) \\
&= H(\mathbf{x}_{2b}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2c}^{(1)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)N}) \\
&= H(\mathbf{x}_{2b}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2c}^{(1)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)N}). \qquad (37)
\end{aligned}
$$

Above equation is obtained by using the fact that $I(\mathbf{x}_{2b}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2c}^{(1)N}; \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) = 0$. This can be shown with the help of functional dependency graph. It can also be shown by using the fact that given the cooperating signals i.e. $\mathbf{v}_{12}^N$ and $\mathbf{v}_{21}^N$, encoded message $\mathbf{x}_2^N$ is independent of $\mathbf{x}_1^N$ and vice-versa. In a similar way, the third term in (36) can be simplified to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^N | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, W_1) \\
&= H(\mathbf{x}_{2b}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2c}^{(1)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)N}, W_1). \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}
$$

From (37) and (38), (36) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)N} | \mathbf{v}_{12}^N, \mathbf{v}_{21}^N, \mathbf{x}_{1a}^N, \mathbf{x}_{2a}^N, \mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(1)N}) + N\epsilon_1, \\
\text{or } R_1 &\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}, \mathbf{v}_{21}) + H(\mathbf{y}_{1b}^{(2)}), \\
&\leq 2C + 2m - n. \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}
$$



(a) (b)

Fig. 3. SLDIC with $m = 5$ and $n = 4$: (a) Different types of links, (b) $C = 1$ and $R_S = 3$.

D. Proof of Theorem 4

Using Fano's inequality, the rate of user-1 is upper bounded as

$$NR_1 \leq I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N) + N\epsilon_1 \overset{(a)}{=} I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon_1,$$
$$\text{or } R_1 \overset{(b)}{=} 0, \tag{40}$$

where (a) is obtained using the fact that $\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_2$ and (b) is obtained using the perfect secrecy condition. This completes the proof.

E. Details of the achievable scheme for the SLDIC when $(0 < \alpha < 1)$

First, note that the links in the LDIC can be classified into three categories: Type I, Type II, and Type III, as shown in Fig. 3(a). The classification is based on whether the data bits are received cleanly or with interference at the intended receiver, and whether or not they cause interference at the unintended receiver. The number (r_1) of Type I and (r_2) of Type II links are $r_1 = r_2 = \frac{m-l}{2} = m - n$, where l is the number of Type III links, which is given by $l = 2n - m$. In this case, the achievable scheme uses interference cancelation in addition to random bit transmission.

The bits transmitted on the Type II links $[1 : m - n]$ are not received at the unintended receiver, hence, it is possible to transmit at least r_2 bits securely. Bits transmitted on the levels $[r_2+1 : r_2+C]$ at transmitter i will interfere with the levels $[1 : C]$ of receiver j. The interference

can be eliminated by precoding the data bits at levels $[1:C]$ at transmitter j with the data bits of transmitter i, received through cooperation. Data bits transmitted on the Type III/I links (levels $[m-n+1:n]/[n+1:m]$) will cause interference at the unintended receiver, and it is not possible to ensure secrecy with uncoded data transmission on these levels. As the Type II links are already used up for data transmission, the remaining $g \triangleq \{n-(r_2+C)\}^+$ levels can be used for transmission with the help of random bits sent by each transmitter. Transmitter i sends the random bits in such a way that they superimpose with the data bits sent by the other transmitter, at receiver i. Note that, the receiver does not require the knowledge of these random bits in order to decode its own message.

Now, it is required to determine the number of levels of Type I/III links that can be used for data transmission. Notice that bits transmitted on any level get shifted down by $m-n$ levels at the unintended receiver. In the proposed scheme, transmission occurs in blocks of size $3(m-n)$ levels, with each block consisting of a sequence of data bits, random bits and zero-bits of size $m-n$ each, sent on consecutive levels. Such a scheme ensures that the intended data bits are received cleanly at the desired receiver, and, data received at the unintended receiver remains secure. The total number of blocks of size $3(m-n)$ that can be sent is $B \triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{g}{3(m-n)} \right\rfloor$. The remaining $t \triangleq g\%\{3(m-n)\}$ levels may or may not be usable for data transmission depending on the number of levels remaining for random bit transmission. The quantity $q = \min\{(t-r_2)^+, r_2\}$ is the number of data bits that can be securely sent on the remaining t levels.

Mathematically, the message $\mathbf{x}_1$ of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows:

Case 1 $(q=0)$*:*

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(m-(r_2+C))^+\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}_{(r_2+C)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(m-C)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^c_{C\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}^u_{p\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p'\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{41}$$

where $\mathbf{a} \triangleq [a_{r_2+C}, a_{r_2+C-1}, \ldots, a_1]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^c \triangleq [b_{r_2+C}, b_{r_2+C-1}, \ldots, b_{r_2+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}^u \triangleq [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{d}_2, \mathbf{z}_3, \mathbf{u}_4, \mathbf{d}_5, \mathbf{z}_6, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{3B-2}, \mathbf{d}_{3B-1}, \mathbf{z}_{3B},]^T$, $\mathbf{u}_l \triangleq \left[a_{m-(l-1)r_2}, a_{m-(l-1)r_2-1}, \ldots, a_{m-lr_2+1}\right]$, $\mathbf{d}_l \triangleq \left[d_{m-(l-1)r_2}, d_{m-(l-1)r_2-1}, \ldots, d_{m-lr_2+1}\right]$, $\mathbf{z}_l$ is a zero vector of size $1\times r_2$, $p \triangleq 3B(m-n)$ and $p' \triangleq m-p$. The encoding at transmitter 2 is similar.

Case 2 $(q \neq 0)$*:* The number of data bits that can be sent on the remaining t levels is

$q = \min\{(t-r_2)^+, r_2\}$. In this case, the message of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows.

$$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{mod}} = \mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{p\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a'}_{t\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-(p+t))\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{42}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_1$ is as defined in (41), $\mathbf{a'} \triangleq [\mathbf{u}_{11}, \mathbf{u}_{12}, \mathbf{d}_{11}, \mathbf{d}_{12}, \mathbf{z}]^T$, $\mathbf{u}_{11} = [a_{m-p}, a_{m-p-1}, \ldots, a_{m-p-q+1}]$, $\mathbf{d}_{11} \triangleq [d_{m-w}, d_{m-w-1}, \ldots, d_{m-w-q+1}]$. Also, $\mathbf{u}_{12}$, $\mathbf{d}_{12}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ are zero vectors of size $1\times v$, $1\times f$, and $1\times v'$, respectively. Here, $v \triangleq (r_2 - q)$, $f \triangleq (t-(r_2+q))^+$, $w \triangleq p + r_2$ and $v' \triangleq (t-2r_2)^+$.

With a little bookkeeping, it can be shown that, the proposed scheme achieves the following symmetric secrecy rate:

$$R_s = m - n + B(m-n) + q + \min\{n, C\}. \tag{43}$$

F. Details of the achievable scheme for the SLDIC when $(1 < \alpha < 2)$

1) When $(1 < \alpha \leq 1.5)$*:* The achievable scheme uses transmission of random bits, interference cancelation, or both, depending on the capacity of the cooperative link. The bits received through the cooperative links are transmitted on the levels $[1 : C]$. As the $n - m$ lower levels are not present to the intended receiver, these levels can be used for relaying other user's data bits. Any data bits transmitted on the levels higher than $n - m$ will cause interference. The cooperative data bits transmitted by transmitter i on levels higher than $n - m$ $[n - m + 1 : C]$ are canceled by transmitter j by transmitting the same data bits along with the data bits of user i $(i \neq j)$.

In the remaining higher levels, it is possible to transmit data bits securely with the help of transmission of random bits. The transmission of random bits is similar to that in case of moderate interference regime. The message of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows

- Case 1 $((t-r_2)^+ = 0)$):

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}^e_{p\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{s\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}^e_{(n-C)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}_{C\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}^e_{v\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}^l_{(C-r2)^+\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{44}$$

  where $\mathbf{a}^e \triangleq [\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{z}_3, \mathbf{d}_4, \mathbf{u}_5, \mathbf{z}_6, \ldots, \mathbf{d}_{3B-2}, \mathbf{u}_{3B-1}, \mathbf{z}_{3B},]^T$, $\mathbf{u}_l \triangleq [a_{n-(l-1)r_2}, a_{n-(l-1)r_2-1}, \ldots, a_{n-lr_2+1}]$, $\mathbf{d}_l \triangleq \left[d_{n-(l-1)r_2}, d_{n-(l-1)r_2-1}, \ldots, d_{n-lr_2+1}\right]$, $\mathbf{z}_l$ is a zero vector of size $1\times r_2$, $\mathbf{b} \triangleq [b_C, b_{C-1}, \ldots, b_1]^T$, $\mathbf{a}^l = [a_C, a_{C-1}, \ldots, a_{r_2+1}]^T$ $p \triangleq 3Br_2$, $s \triangleq n - p$ and $v \triangleq (n - (C - r_2)^+)$.

- Case 2 $((t-r_2)^+ \neq 0)$:

$$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{mod}} = \mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{w\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a'}_{t\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{s\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{45}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_1$ is as defined in (44), $\mathbf{a'} \triangleq [\mathbf{d}_{11}, \mathbf{d}_{12}, \mathbf{u}_{11}, \mathbf{u}_{12}, \mathbf{z'}]^T$, $\mathbf{u}_{11} = [a_{n-3Br_2-q-v'}, a_{n-3Br_2-q-v'-1}, \ldots, a_{n-3Br_2-2q-v'+1}]$, $\mathbf{d}_{11} \triangleq [d_{n-3Br_2}, d_{n-3Br_2-1}, \ldots, d_{n-3Br_2-q+1}]$. Also, $\mathbf{d}_{12}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{12}$ are zero vectors of size $1 \times v'$ and $\mathbf{z'}$ is a zero vector of size $1 \times f$. Here, $v' \triangleq (n-m-q)^+$, $f \triangleq (t-2(q+v'))^+$, $s \triangleq n-m+C$ and $w \triangleq (n-t-s)^+$.

The proposed encoding scheme achieves the following symmetric secrecy rate:

$$R_s = B(n-m) + C + q. \tag{46}$$

2) When $(1.5 < \alpha < 2)$: The links in the SLDIC can be classified into three categories: Type I, Type II, and Type III, as shown in Fig. 4(a). The classification is based on whether the data bits are received cleanly or with interference at the intended receiver, and whether or not they are present to the intended receiver.

Case 1 *When $(0 \leq C \leq 4n-6m)$:* In this case, the achievable scheme uses a combination of interference cancelation, transmission of random bits and relaying of other user's data bits. The data bits transmitted by transmitter i on the levels associated with Type II links $[n-m+1:m]$ will be received at the unintended receiver j $(j \neq i)$. In order to ensure secrecy, transmitter j transmits random bits on the levels $[2(n-m)+1:n]$. The remaining levels can be used for transmitting other user's data bits received through cooperation. The cooperative bits are transmitted on the levels corresponding to Type I and Type III links. The $C_1 = \lfloor \frac{C}{2} \rfloor$ data bits transmitted by transmitter i for transmitter j on the levels corresponding to Type III links will not be received at the receiver i and hence, will remain secure. The data bits transmitted on the levels corresponding to Type I links by transmitter i for transmitter j will cause interference at receiver i. The interference is required to be canceled by transmitter j by transmitting the same bits.

The achievable scheme is shown for $m=5$ and $n=8$ for $C=2$ in Fig. 4(b). The message

of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_{l\times 1} \\ \\ \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-l)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{a}_{l\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m-C_2)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^u_{C_2\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^l_{C_1\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m-C_1)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{a'}_{C_2\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m-C_2)\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

where $\mathbf{d} \triangleq [d_n, d_{n-1}, \ldots, d_{n-l+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a} \triangleq [a_l, a_{l-1}, \ldots, a_1]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^l \triangleq [b_{n-m}, a_{n-m-1}, \ldots, b_{n-m-C_1+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^u \triangleq [b_{m+C_2}, b_{m+C_2-1}, \ldots, b_{m+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a'} \triangleq [a_{m+C_2}, a_{m+C_2-1}, \ldots, a_{m+1}]^T$ and $l \triangleq 2m-n$. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate

$$R_s = 2m - n + C. \quad (48)$$

Case 2 *When* $(4n-6m < C \leq n)$*:* In this case, $4n-6m$ cooperative data bits out of C cooperative bits obtained through cooperation are used in a similar way as described in the previous case. Define $C_1 \triangleq C_2 \triangleq 2n-3m$. The remaining cooperative bits $C' \triangleq C-(4n-6m)$ is used as explained below. Let $C'' \triangleq \left\lceil \frac{C'}{3} \right\rceil$. The number of data bits that can be relayed by transmitter i for transmitter j on the lower levels corresponding to Type III links is $C_{T_3} = \min\{2m-n, C''\}$. The remaining cooperative bits $C_{\text{rem}} = (C'-C_{T_3})^+$ are transmitted on the levels corresponding to Type I and II links. The $C_{T_1} \triangleq \min\left\{\left\lceil \frac{C_{\text{rem}}}{2} \right\rceil, 2m-n\right\}$ cooperative bits sent by transmitter i causes interference at receiver i. These bits are canceled by transmitter j by sending the same C_{T_1} bits. The remaining $C_{T_2} = \min\{2m-n, (C_{\text{rem}}-C_{T_1})^+\}$ bits are transmitted on the Type II links by transmitter i. These data bits cause interference at receiver i, which is canceled by transmitter j. The number of data bits that can be sent on the Type II links with the help of transmission of random bits is $r_d = \min\{(2m-n-C_{T_3})^+, 2m-n-C_{T_2}\}$. The achievable scheme is shown for $m=5$, $n=8$ and $C=4$ in Fig. 4. The message of transmitter 1 is



(a) (b) (c)

Fig. 4. SLDIC with $m = 5$ and $n = 8$: (a) Different types of links, (b) $C = 2$, $R_S = 4$ (c) $C = 4$, $R_S = 5$.

encoded as follows.

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(2m-n)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^u_{(2n-3m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(2m-n)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^l_{(2n-3m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(2m-n)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m-C_{T_1})^+\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}'^u_{C_{T_1}\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_{T_3})\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}'^l_{C_{T_3}\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_{T_2})\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{b}^m_{C_{T_2}\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{a}^u_{(2n-3m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(2m-n-C_{T_2})\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}^m_{C_{T_2}\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_{T_1})\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{a}'^u_{C_{T_1}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}^m_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_{r_d\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m-r_d)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}^e_{r_d\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-r_d)\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{49}$$

where $\mathbf{b}^l \triangleq [b_{n-m}, d_{n-m-1}, \ldots, b_{2m-n+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^u \triangleq [b_{2(n-m)}, d_{2(n-m)-1}, \ldots, b_{m+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{b}'^l \triangleq [b_{C_{T_3}}, b_{C_{T_3}-1}, \ldots, b_1]^T$, $\mathbf{b}'^u \triangleq [b_{2(n-m)+C_{T_1}}, b_{2(n-m)+C_{T_1}-1}, \ldots, b_{2(n-m)+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{b}'^m \triangleq [b_{n-m+C_{T_2}}, b_{n-m+C_{T_2}-1}, \ldots, b_{n-m+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}^u \triangleq [a_{2(n-m)}, a_{2(n-m)-1}, \ldots, a_{m+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}^m \triangleq [a_{n-m+C_{T_2}}, a_{n-m+C_{T_2}-1}, \ldots, a_{n-m+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}'^u \triangleq [a_{2(n-m)+C_{T_1}}, a_{2(n-m)+C_{T_1}-1}, \ldots, a_{2(n-m)+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{d} \triangleq [d_n, d_{n-1}, \ldots, d_{n-r_d+1}]^T$ and $\mathbf{a}^e \triangleq [a_{2m-n}, a_{2m-n-1}, \ldots, a_{2m-n-r_d+1}]^T$. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate

$$R_S = 4n - 6m + C_{T_1} + C_{T_2} + C_{T_3} + r_d. \tag{50}$$

G. Details of the achievable scheme for the SLDIC when $(\alpha \geq 2)$

1) When $0 < C \leq \frac{m}{2}$ *and* m *is even:* In this case, interestingly, transmitters share only random bits through the cooperative links. Each transmitter generates C random bits independent of data bits with $\mathrm{Bern}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$. The achievable scheme involves transmitting the data bits xored with the random bits. The same random bits are transmitted by the other transmitter, so as to cancel them out at the desired receiver. Through careful observation it is found that sharing random bits through the cooperative links can achieve higher secrecy rate as compared to sharing data bits only. The achievable scheme is illustrated for random bits sharing and data bits sharing for $C = 1$ in Figs. 5(a) and 5(b), respectively.

In this case, the message of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows.

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(m-2C)^+ \times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}_{2C \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-2C)\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{d}^1_{2C\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(m-2C)^+ \times 1} \\ \mathbf{d}^2_{2C \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{51}$$

where $\mathbf{a} = [a_{2C}, a_{2C-1}, \ldots, a_1]^T$, $\mathbf{d}^1 = [e_C, d_C, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$ and $\mathbf{d}^2 = [d_C, e_C, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate

$$R_s = 2C. \tag{52}$$

With data bits sharing, the achievable scheme achieves

$$R_s = C. \tag{53}$$

2) When $(\frac{m}{2} < C \leq n - \frac{3m}{2})$ *and* m *is even:* In this case, both the transmitter exchanges $\frac{m}{2}$ random bits and $(C - \frac{m}{2})$ data bits. The random bits are used in a similar way as described for $0 < C \leq \frac{m}{2}$ and even valued m case. The links corresponding to the levels from $[m+1 : n-m]$ are present only to the unintended receiver and bits transmitted on these levels are received cleanly at the unintended receiver. Hence, any data bits transmitted on these levels for the other user will remain secure. In this case, the message of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows.

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}_{m\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{d}^1_{m\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}^2_{m\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-C-\frac{m}{2})\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^c_{C-\frac{m}{2}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{54}$$



(a) Random bits sharing: $R_s = 2$. (b) Data bits sharing: $R_s = 1$.

Fig. 5. SLDIC with $m = 2$ and $n = 4$

where $\mathbf{a} = [a_m, a_{m-1}, \ldots, a_1]^T$, $\mathbf{d}^1 = [e_{\frac{m}{2}}, d_{\frac{m}{2}}, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$, $\mathbf{d}^2 = [d_{\frac{m}{2}}, e_{\frac{m}{2}}, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ and $\mathbf{b}^c = [b_{\frac{m}{2}+C}, b_{\frac{m}{2}+C-1}, \ldots, b_{m+1}]^T$. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate

$$R_s = \frac{m}{2} + C. \tag{55}$$

3) When $(n - \frac{3m}{2} < C < n - \frac{m}{2})$ and m is even: In this case, the achievable scheme uses transmission of random bits, interference cancelation, time sharing and relaying of other user's data bits. The transmitters share a combination of random bits and data bits through the cooperative links. To simplify the understanding of the achievable scheme, consider $\alpha = 2$ case. In this case, both the transmitters share $\frac{m}{2}$ random bits along with $C_1 = C - \frac{m}{2}$ data bits. In the first time slot, transmitter 1 sends the m random bits (d_i and e_i) on alternate levels in $[1 : m]$. In order to eliminate the interference caused by these random bits at receiver 2, the data bits of transmitter 2 are precoded (xored) with these m random bits and transmitted on the levels from $[m+1 : 2m]$ from transmitter 2. The random bits are not canceled at receiver 1. Further, receiver 1 has no knowledge of these random bits. Hence, it cannot decode the bits intended to receiver 2. Also, the data bits of transmitter 2 received through the cooperative link are transmitted at the upper levels $[n - C_1 + 1 : n]$ from transmitter 1. Again, in order to ensure secrecy at receiver 1, transmitter 2 sends the same data bits at levels $[m - C_1 + 1 : m]$ along with the C_1 data bits of transmitter 1, also received through cooperation. This not only cancels the interference due to the bits sent on levels $[n - C_1 + 1 : n]$ at receiver 1, but also enables transmitter 2 to relay

the data bits of transmitter 1.

In the remaining upper levels $[m+1:n-C_1]$, transmitter 1 sends its own data bits xored with random bits. Transmitter 2 transmits the same random bits on levels $[1:C_1]$ to cancel the random bits at receiver 1. In this way, transmitter 1 sends $m-C_1$ data bits of its own and C_1 data bits of transmitter 2, in the first time slot. Simultaneously, transmitter 2 is able to send m data bits of its own and C_1 data bits of transmitter 1. In the second time slot, the roles of transmitters 1 and 2 are reversed. Figures 6(a) and 6(b) illustrate the scheme for $m=2$ and $n=4$, with $C=2$ bits.

When $\alpha > 2$, it is straightforward to extend the achievable scheme described above for the $\alpha = 2$ case. Both the transmitter exchanges $\frac{m}{2}$ random bits and $C' = C - \frac{m}{2}$ data bits. Out of C' data bits obtained through cooperation, $n-2m$ data bits are relayed from the levels $[m+1:n-m]$ for helping other user's transmission securely. The m random bits and the remaining data bits obtained through cooperation $C_1 = C' - n + 2m$ are used in a similar manner as explained for the $\alpha = 2$ case. The message of transmitter 1 in the first time slot is encoded as follows.

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{d}^1_{m\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}^c_{C_1\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-C_1)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{C_1\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}_{(m-C_1)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{C_1\times 1} \\ \mathbf{d}^2_{(m-C_1)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b'}^c_{(n-2m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{56}$$

where $\mathbf{d}^1 = [e_{m/2}, d_{m/2}, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^c = [b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_{n-C_1+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a} = [a_{m-C_1}, \ldots, a_2, a_1]^T$, $\mathbf{d}^2 = [d_q, e_q, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if $m-C_1$ is even, $\mathbf{d}^2 = [e_{q+1}, d_q, e_q, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if $m-C_1$ is odd, $q = \lfloor \frac{m-C_1}{2} \rfloor$ and $\mathbf{b'}^c = [b_{n-m}, b_{n-m-1} \ldots, b_{m+1}]^T$.

The message of transmitter 2 in the first time slot is encoded as follows.

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_{m\times 1} \oplus \mathbf{e}^2_{m\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^l_{C_1\times 1} \oplus \mathbf{a}^c_{C_1\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_1)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m+C_1)\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{e}^1_{(m-C_1)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a'}^c_{(n-2m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{57}$$

where $\mathbf{b} = [b_m, b_{m-1}, \ldots, b_1]^T$, $\mathbf{e}^2 = [e_{m/2}, d_{m/2}, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^l = [b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_{n-C_1+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}^c = [a_m, b_{m-1}, \ldots, b_{m-C_1+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{e}^1 = [d_q, e_q, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if $m-C_1$ is even, $\mathbf{d}^2 = [e_{q+1}, d_q, e_q, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if $m-C_1$ is odd, $q = \lfloor \frac{m-C_1}{2} \rfloor$ and $\mathbf{a'}^c = [a_{n-m}, a_{n-m-1}, \ldots, a_{m+1}]^T$. In the second



(a) First slot: $(R_1, R_2) = (2, 3)$. (b) Second slot: $(R_1, R_2) = (3, 2)$.

Fig. 6. SLDIC with $m = 2$ and $n = 4$: $C = 2$ and $R_s = 2.5$.

time slot, the encoding for transmitter 1 and 2 can be reversed. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate

$$R_s = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{m}{4} + \frac{C}{2}. \tag{58}$$

4) When $(n - \frac{m}{2} \leq C \leq n)$: In this cases, both the transmitters share $\min\{n, C\}$ data bits and the achievable scheme uses interference cancelation. The message of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-C+m)^+ \times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{a}_{(C-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-C)^+ \times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{b}_{C\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{59}$$

where $\mathbf{a} = [a_C, a_{C-1}, \ldots, a_{m+1}]^T$ and $\mathbf{b} = [b_C, b_{C-1}, \ldots, b_1]^T$. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate.

$$R_s = \min\{n, C\}. \tag{60}$$

5) When $0 < C \leq \frac{m+1}{2}$ and m is odd: The achievable scheme is same as that mentioned for $\alpha \geq 2$ and even valued m case. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate:

$$R_s = \min\{2C, m\}. \tag{61}$$

6) When $\frac{m+1}{2} < C \leq \frac{2n-3m+1}{2}$ and m is odd: In this case, the achievable scheme is same as that mentioned for ($\frac{m}{2} < C \leq n - \frac{3m}{2}$) and even valued m case. The message of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}^u_{m\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-2m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{d}^l_{m\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m-C')\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^c_{C'\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{62}$$

where $\mathbf{d}^u = [e_{\frac{m+1}{2}}, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$, $\mathbf{d}^l = [d_{\frac{m+1}{2}}, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^c = [a_{m+C'}, a_{m+C'-1}, \ldots, a_{m+1}]^T$ and $C' = C - \frac{m+1}{2}$. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate

$$R_s = m + \min\left\{C - \frac{m+1}{2}, n - 2m\right\}. \tag{63}$$

7) When $\frac{2n-3m+1}{2} < C \leq n$ and m is odd: In this case, the achievable scheme is similar to that described in G3. The proposed scheme differs in the way encoding is performed. To simplify the understanding of the encoding scheme, it is explained for the $\alpha = 2$ case. In the first time slot, transmitter 1 sends $C_1^{uu} = \lceil \frac{C}{2} \rceil$ data bits of transmitter 2 received through cooperation on the upper levels $[n - C_1^{uu} + 1 : n]$. In order to ensure secrecy at receiver 1, transmitter 2 sends the same data bits at levels $[m - C_2^{lu} + 1 : m]$ along with the $C_2^{lu} = C_1^{uu}$ data bits of transmitter 1, also received through cooperation. In the remaining upper levels $[m+1 : n-C_1^{uu}]$, transmitter 1 sends $C_1^{ul} = (m - C_1^{uu})^+$ its own data bits xored with random bits. Transmitter 2 sends the same random bits on levels $[1 : C_2^{ll}]$ ($C_2^{ll} = C_1^{ul}$) to cancel the random bits at receiver 1. The number of random cooperative bits used in such transmission is $C_1^r = \left\lceil \frac{C_1^{ul}}{2} \right\rceil$. Also, transmitter 1 relays $C_1^{lu} = (C - C_1^{uu} - C_1^r)^+$ data bits of transmitter 2 received through cooperation on the levels $[m - C_1^{lu} + 1 : m]$. As the links corresponding to these levels are not present to receiver 1, these data bits remain secure. Transmitter 1 sends $C_1^{ll} = \min\{2C_1^r, (m - C_1^{lu})^+)\}$ of random bits on the levels $[1 : C_1^{ll}]$ to ensure secrecy for transmitter 2 data. Transmitter 2 sends its $C_2^{ul} = C_1^{ll}$ data bits precoded with the same random bits transmitted on the levels $[1 : C_1^{ll}]$, to eliminate the random bits at receiver 2. The number of cooperative random bits used by transmitter 2 is $C_2^r = \max\left\{\left\lceil \frac{C_2^{ll}}{2} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{C_2^{ul}}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$. Then. transmitter 2 can relay the remaining $C_2^{uu} = (C - C_2^{lu} - C_2^r)^+$ cooperative data bits on the upper levels $[n - C_2^{uu} + 1 : n]$. As these bits will cause interference at receiver 2, transmitter 1 sends the same data bits on the levels $[m - C_2^{uu} + 1 : m]$ to cancel

the interference at receiver 2. In the first time slot, the message of transmitter 1 is encoded as follows.

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}'^{uu}_{C_1^{uu}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}^{ul}_{C_1^{ul}\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-C_1^{uu}-C_1^{ul})\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}'^{lu}_{C_1^{lu}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_1^{lu}-C_1^{ll})^+\times 1} \\ \mathbf{d}_{C_1^{ll}\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{C_1^{uu}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{d}^{ul}_{C_1^{ul}\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-C_1^{uu}-C_1^{ul})\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^{c}_{(n-2m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}^{lu}_{C_2^{uu}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_2^{uu})^+\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{64}$$

where $\mathbf{b}'^{uu} = [b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_{n-C_1^{uu}+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{b}'^{lu} = [b_m, b_{m-1}, \ldots, b_{m-C_1^{lu}+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}^{ul} = [a_{C_1^{ul}}, a_{C_1^{ul}-1}, \ldots, a_1]^T$, $\mathbf{d}^{ul} = [d_{C_1^r}, e_{C_1^r}, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if C_1^r is even, $\mathbf{d}^{ul} = [e_{C_1^r}, d_{C_1^r-1}, e_{C_1^r-1}, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if C_1^r is odd, $\mathbf{a}^{lu} = [a_n, a_{n-1}, \ldots, a_{n-C_2^{uu}+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{d}^{ll} = [e_{C_1^{ll}}, d_{C_1^{ll}}, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$ if C_1^{ll} is even, $\mathbf{d}^{ll} = [d_{C_1^{ll}}, e_{C_1^{ll}-1}, d_{C_1^{ll}-1} \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$ if C_1^{ll} is odd and $\mathbf{b}'^{c} = [b_{n-m}, b_{n-m-1}, \ldots, b_{m+1}]^T$. The message of transmitter 2 is encoded as follows

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}^{uu}_{(m-C_2^{ul})\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^{ul}_{C_2^{ul}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-2m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{b}^{lu}_{C_2^{lu}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_2^{lu})\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}'^{uu}_{C_2^{uu}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_2^{uu})\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}^{c}_{(n-2m)\times 1} \\ \mathbf{a}'^{lu}_{C_2^{lu}\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_2^{lu})\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-C_2^{ll})\times 1} \\ \\ \\ \\ \mathbf{e}^{ll}_{C_2^{ll}\times 1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(m-C_2^{ul})\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{e}^{ul}_{C_2^{ul}\times 1} \\ \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{65}$$

where $\mathbf{b}^{ul} = [b_{C_2^{ul}}, b_{C_2^{ul}-1}, \ldots, b_1]^T$, $\mathbf{b}^{lu} = [b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_{n-C_2^{lu}+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}'^{uu} = [a_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_{n-C_2^{uu}+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}^{c} = [a_{n-m}, a_{n-m-1}, \ldots, a_{m+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}'^{lu} = [a_m, a_{m-1}, \ldots, a_{m-C_2^{lu}+1}]^T$, $\mathbf{e}^{ll} = [d_{\frac{C_2^{ll}}{2}}, e_{\frac{C_2^{ll}}{2}}, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if C_2^{ll} is even, $\mathbf{e}^{ll} = [e_{\left\lceil \frac{C_2^{ll}}{2} \right\rceil}, d_{\left\lceil \frac{C_2^{ll}}{2} \right\rceil - 1}, \ldots, d_1, e_1]^T$ if C_2^{ll} is odd, $\mathbf{e}^{ul} = [e_{\frac{C_2^{ul}}{2}}, d_{\frac{C_2^{ll}}{2}}, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$ if C_2^{ul} is even and $\mathbf{e}^{ll} = [d_{\left\lceil \frac{C_2^{ul}}{2} \right\rceil}, e_{\left\lceil \frac{C_2^{ul}}{2} \right\rceil - 1}, \ldots, e_1, d_1]^T$ if C_2^{ul} is odd.

In the second time slot, the encoding scheme is reversed for transmitter 1 and 2. The proposed scheme achieves the following secrecy rate

$$R_s = n - 2m + \frac{1}{2}\left[C_1^{ul} + 2C_1^{uu} + C_2^{uu} + C_1^{lu} + C_2^{ul}\right]. \tag{66}$$

H. Proof of Theorem 5

1) Analysis of the probability of error: In the following, the probability of error is analyzed at the encoder and decoder.

Encoding error: For the Marton's coding scheme to succeed, the transmitter 1 and 2 can find at least one jointly typical sequence pair $(\mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N)$ provided following condition is satisfied.

$$\begin{aligned} &R_{cp1} \leq \widetilde{R}_{cp1}, R_{cp2} \leq \widetilde{R}_{cp2}, \\ &R_{cp1} \leq C, R_{cp2} \leq C, \\ &\widetilde{R}_{cp1} - R_{cp1} + \widetilde{R}_{cp2} - R_{cp2} \geq I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{u}_2). \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

When $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{u}_2$ are chosen independent of each other, then $I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{u}_2) = 0$. Given $R_{cp1} \leq \widetilde{R}_{cp1}$ and $R_{cp2} \leq \widetilde{R}_{cp2}$, the last condition in (67) becomes redundant.

Decoding error: Define the following event

$$E_{ijk} = \left\{ \left(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N(i,j), \mathbf{u}_1^N(k) \right) \in T_\epsilon^N \right\}. \tag{68}$$

Without loss of generality, assume that transmitter 1 and 2 sends $\mathbf{x}_1^N(1,1,1,1)$ and $\mathbf{x}_2^N(1,1,1,1,1,1)$ with $(\widetilde{w}_{cp1}, \widetilde{w}_{cp2}) = (1,1)$, respectively. An error occurs if the transmitted and received codewords are not jointly typical or a wrong codeword is jointly typical with the received codewords. Then by the union of events bounds

$$\lambda_e^{(n)} = P\left(E_{111}^c \bigcup \cup_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1, k\neq 1} E_{ijk} \right) \leq P(E_{111}^c) + P(\cup_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1, k\neq 1} E_{ijk}). \tag{69}$$

From the joint AEP [29], $P(E_{111}^c) \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. When $i \neq 1, j \neq 1$, and $k = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ij1} = \sum_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1} P(E_{ij1}) &\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1} + R'_{p1}\right]} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{u}_1^N), \\ &\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1} + R'_{p1} - I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_1) + 4\epsilon\right]}. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{ij1} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$R_{p1} + R'_{p1} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_1). \tag{71}$$

When the above condition is satisfied, also, the probability of error λ_{1j1} and λ_{i11} goes to zero as $N \to \infty$. When $k \neq 1$ and $(i,j) = (1,1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{11k} = \sum_{k\neq 1} P(E_{11k}) &\leq 2^{N\widetilde{R}_{cp1}} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N), \\ &\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1} - I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}) + 4\epsilon\right]}. \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{11k} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$\widetilde{R}_{cp1} \leq I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}). \tag{73}$$

When $i \neq 1$, $j \neq 1$, and $k \neq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{ijk} = \sum_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1, k\neq 1} P(E_{ijk}) &\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1}+R_{p1}+R'_{p1}\right]} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N), \\ &\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1}+R_{p1}+R'_{p1}-I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1)+4\epsilon\right]}. \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{ijk} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$\widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{p1} + R'_{p1} \leq I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1). \tag{75}$$

The above condition also ensures that λ_{i1k} and λ_{1jk} go to zero as $N \to \infty$. Hence, $\lambda_e^{(n)}$ in (69) goes to 0 as $N \to \infty$, when the conditions in (71), (73) and (75) are satisfied.

Now, using the Fourier-Motzkin procedure [30], the achievable rate in Theorem 5 is obtained. The choice of R'_{p1} is discussed in Section H2.

Choice of $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{u}_2$

The cooperative private auxiliary codeword $\mathbf{u}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ are chosen such that the interference caused by the cooperative codeword $\mathbf{u}_j$ at receiver i $(i \neq j)$ is nulled out completely. This not only eliminates the interference caused by the cooperative private part, but also ensures secrecy for the cooperative private message. Choose $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}$, $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{u}_2$ be jointly Gaussian such that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp} &= \mathbf{w}_{1z}\underline{v}_{1z} + \mathbf{w}_{2z}\underline{v}_{2z}, \\ \mathbf{u}_1 &= [h_d \quad h_c]\, \underline{v}_{1z}\mathbf{w}_{1z}, \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_2 = [h_c \quad h_d]\, \underline{v}_{2z}\mathbf{w}_{2z}, \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

where $\underline{v}_{1z} \triangleq [h_d \qquad -h_c]^T$, $\underline{v}_{2z} \triangleq [-h_c \qquad h_d]^T$ and $\mathbf{w}_{1z}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{2z}$ are independent Gaussian with variance σ_{1z}^2 and σ_{2z}^2, respectively. Recall that $\mathbf{w}_{iz}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ is the codeword representing the cooperative private message w_{cpi} of transmitter i. The choice of σ_{1z}^2 and σ_{2z}^2 is discussed in Corollary 1.

2) Equivocation computation: The equivocation at the receiver 2 is bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} H(W_1|\mathbf{y}_2^N) &= H(W_{p1}, W_{cp1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N), \\ &= H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) + H(W_{cp1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N, W_{p1}). \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

First consider the term $H(W_{cp1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N, W_{p1})$. The output at the receiver 2 is

$$y_2 = u_2 + h_d x_{d2} + h_c x_{p1} + z_2. \tag{78}$$

As $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{u}_2$ are chosen to be independent of each other i.e., $I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{u}_2) = 0$ and w_{cp1} is chosen independent of w_{p1}, following holds.

$$H(W_{cp1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N, W_{p1}) = H(W_{cp1}). \tag{79}$$

Hence, it is only required to show the following.

$$H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) \geq N\left[R_{p1} - \epsilon_s\right]. \tag{80}$$

Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) \\
&\geq H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}''), \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}'') - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}''), \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}'') - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1}, W_{d2}'') - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}''), \\
&= H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{d2}'') + H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{d2}'') - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1}, W_{d2}'') \\
&\qquad - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}''), \\
&\geq H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{d2}'') + H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{d2}'') - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) \\
&\qquad - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1}, W_{d2}''), \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{d2}'') + H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) \\
&\qquad - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1}, W_{d2}''), \\
&= N\left[R_{p1} + R_{p1}' + R_{d2}'\right] - I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1}, W_{d2}''),
\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where (a) and (b) are obtained using the relation: $H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}'') = H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}'') + H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}'')$ and $H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}'') = H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{d2}'') + H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, W_{p1}, W_{d2}'')$, respectively; and (c) is obtained using the fact that $W_{d2}'' \to (\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) \to \mathbf{y}_2^N$ forms a Markov chain. This can be shown with the help of functional dependency graph (FDG) [31].

Using Lemma 1, it can be shown that

$$I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N) \leq N I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}) + N\epsilon'. \tag{82}$$

To bound the last term in (82), consider the joint decoding of W'_{p1} and W'_{d2} at receiver 2 assuming that a genie has given W_{p1} and W''_{d2} as side information to receiver 2. For a given $W_{p1} = w_{p1}$ and $W''_{d2} = w''_{d2}$, assume that w'_{p1} and w'_{d2} are sent by transmitter 1 and 2, respectively and receiver 2 knows the sequence $\mathbf{y}_2^N = y_2^N$ and $\mathbf{u}_2^N = u_2^N$. For a given $W_{p1} = w_{p1}$ and $W''_{d2} = w''_{d2}$, receiver 2 declares that j and l was sent if $(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N(w_{p1}, j), \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(l, w''_{d2}), \mathbf{y}_2^N)$ is jointly typical and such (j, l) exists and unique. Otherwise, an error is declared. Now, define the following event

$$E_{jl}^1 = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N(w_{p1}, j), \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(l, w''_{d2}), \mathbf{y}_2^N) \in T_\epsilon^N(P_{\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}, \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}}) \right\}. \tag{83}$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N(w_{p1}, 1)$ ans $\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(1, w''_{d2})$ was sent. Then, by the union of events bound following is obtained.

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{e1}^N &= P\left(E_{11}^{1^c} \bigcup \cup_{j\neq 1, l\neq 1} E_{jl}^1\right), \\
&\leq P(E_{11}^{1^c}) + \sum_{j\neq 1} P(E_{j1}^1) + \sum_{l\neq 1} P(E_{1l}^1) + \sum_{j\neq 1, l\neq 1} P(E_{jl}^1), \\
&\leq P(E_{11}^{1^c}) + 2^{NR'_{p1}} 2^{-N[I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{d2}, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}) - 3\epsilon]} + 2^{NR'_{d2}} 2^{-N[I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}) - 3\epsilon]} \\
&\qquad + 2^{N\left(R'_{p1} + R'_{d2}\right)} 2^{-N[I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}) - 3\epsilon]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Hence, the probability of error P_{e1}^N is arbitrarily small for large N, provided the following conditions are satisfied.

$$\begin{aligned}
&R'_{P1} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{d2}, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}), \;\; R'_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}), \\
&R'_{p1} + R'_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

When the conditions in (85) are satisfied and for sufficiently large N, the following bound is obtained using Fano's inequality.

$$H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N | \mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1} = w_{p1}, W''_{d2} = w''_{d2}) \leq N\delta_1. \tag{86}$$

Finally, the last term in (81) is bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N | \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1}, W_{d2}'') \\
&= \sum_{w_{p1}, w_{d2}''} P(w_{p1}, w_{d2}') H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N | \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, W_{p1} = w_{p1}, W_{d2}'' = w_{d2}'), \\
&\leq N\delta_1. \qquad (87)
\end{aligned}$$

Using (82) and (87), (81) becomes

$$H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) \geq N\left[R_{p1} + R_{p1}' + R_{d2}' - I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}) - \epsilon_1\right], \qquad (88)$$

where $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon' + \delta_1$. By choosing $R_{p1}' + R_{d2}' = I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{x}_{p2}) - \epsilon_{11}$, (88) becomes

$$H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) \geq N\left[R_{p1} - \epsilon_s\right], \text{ where } \epsilon_s = \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_{11}. \qquad (89)$$

Hence, by choosing $R_{p1}' = I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2) - \epsilon_{11}'$ and $R_{d2}' = I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2) - \epsilon_{11}''$, secrecy is ensured for the non-cooperative private message of transmitter 1 and also, it satisfies the condition in (85).

The equivocation at the receiver 1 is bounded as follows. For the receiver 1, it is required to show the following, as the cooperative private part sent by transmitter 2 is canceled completely at receiver 1. Now, consider the following.

$$H(W_{p2}|\mathbf{y}_1^N) \geq H(W_{p2}|\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, W_{d2}'). \qquad (90)$$

Then, by following similar steps as used in case of receiver 2, it can be shown that the choice of $R_{p2}' = I(\mathbf{x}_{p2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{u}_1) - \epsilon_2'$ and $R_{d2}'' = I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_1) - \epsilon_2''$, ensures secrecy for the non-cooperative private message of transmitter 2. This completes the proof.

I. Proof of Corollary 1

In the first and second time slots, transmitters 1 and 2 send the following encoded messages.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{x}_1(1) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[1](1) + \mathbf{x}_{p1}(1), \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_2(1) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[2](1) + \mathbf{x}_{p2}(1) + \mathbf{x}_{d2}(1). \\
&\mathbf{x}_1(2) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[1](2) + \mathbf{x}_{p1}(2) + \mathbf{x}_{d1}(2), \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_2(2) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[2](2) + \mathbf{x}_{p2}(2). \qquad (91)
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, the achievable secrecy rate and power allocation for different messages are discussed in case of first time slot. In the following, the time index is omitted. The mutual

information terms given in Theorem 5 are evaluated as follows. From Theorem 5, R'_{p1} and R'_{p2} are set as: $0.5\log\left(1+\frac{h_c^2P_{p1}}{1+h_d^2P_{d2}}\right)$ and $0.5\log(1+\frac{h_c^2P_{p2}}{1+h_c^2P_{d2}})$, respectively. The first equation in (15) becomes

$$R_1 \leq 0.5\log\left(1+\frac{\sigma_u^2+h_d^2P_{p1}}{1+h_c^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p2}}\right)-R'_{p1}. \tag{92}$$

The second equation in (15) becomes

$$R_1 \leq 0.5\log\left(1+\frac{h_d^2P_{p1}}{1+h_c^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p2}}\right)+\min\left\{C, 0.5\log\left(1+\frac{\sigma_u^2}{1+h_c^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p2}}\right)\right\}-R'_{p1}. \tag{93}$$

The achievable rate for user 2 becomes.

$$R_2 \leq 0.5\log\left(1+\frac{\sigma_u^2+h_d^2P_{p2}}{1+h_d^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p1}}\right)-R'_{p2}, \tag{94}$$

$$R_2 \leq 0.5\log\left(1+\frac{h_d^2P_{p2}}{1+h_d^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p1}}\right)+\min\left\{C, 0.5\log\left(1+\frac{\sigma_u^2}{1+h_d^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p1}}\right)\right\}-R'_{p2}. \tag{95}$$

The encoded message at transmitters 1 and 2 are

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = h_d\mathbf{w}_{1z}-h_c\mathbf{w}_{2z}+\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_2 = h_d\mathbf{w}_{2z}-h_c\mathbf{w}_{1z}+\mathbf{x}_{p2}+\mathbf{x}_{d2}. \tag{96}$$

To simplify the power allocation, the variance of $\mathbf{w}_{1z}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{2z}$ are chosen to be same. In order to satisfy the power constraint, the following conditions need to be satisfied.

$$(h_d^2+h_c^2)\sigma_z^2+P_{p1}\leq P_1 \text{ and } (h_d^2+h_c^2)\sigma_z^2+P_{p2}+P_{d2}\leq P_2, \tag{97}$$

where $P_i=\beta P\,(i=1,2)$ and $0\leq\beta\leq 1$. The power for the non-cooperative private message, cooperative private message and dummy message are chosen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma_z^2=\frac{\theta_1}{\theta_1+\theta_2}\frac{P_1}{h_d^2+h_c^2}, P_{p1}=\frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1+\theta_2}P_1,\\ &P_{p2}=\frac{\eta_1}{\eta_1+\eta_2}P', P_{d2}=\frac{\eta_2}{\eta_1+\eta_2}P', \text{ and } P'=(P_2-(h_d^2+h_c^2)\sigma_z^2)^+.\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

where $(\theta_i,\eta_i)\in[0,1]$. The parameters θ_i and η_i act as power splitting parameter for transmitter 1 and 2, respectively. The parameter β acts as a power control parameter. Hence, θ_i, η_i and β_i are chosen such that the rate in (92)-(95) are maximized and the minimum of (92) and (93) gives the achievable secrecy rate for transmitter 1 i.e., $R_1^*(1)$ and the minimum of (94) and (95) give the achievable secrecy rate for the transmitter 2. i.e., $R_2^*(1)$. This completes the proof.

J. Proof of Theorem 6

1) Analysis of the probability of error: The conditions for encoding error to go to zero and the choice of $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{u}_2$ remains same as in the proof of Theorem 5. Hence, in the following, error at the decoder is analyzed.

Decoding error: Define the following event

$$E_{ijkl} = \left\{ \left(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N(i,j), \mathbf{u}_1^N(k), \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N(l) \right) \in T_\epsilon^N \right\}. \tag{99}$$

Without loss of generality, assume that transmitter 1 and 2 sends $\mathbf{x}_1^N(1,1,1,1)$ and $\mathbf{x}_2^N(1,1,1,1)$ with $(\widetilde{w}_{cp1}, \widetilde{w}_{cp2}) = (1,1)$, respectively. An error occurs if the transmitted and received codewords are not jointly typical or a wrong codeword is jointly typical with the received codewords. Then by the union of events bounds

$$\lambda_e^{(n)} = P\left(E_{1111}^c \bigcup \cup_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1, k\neq 1, l\neq 1} E_{ijkl} \right) \leq P(E_{1111}^c) + P(\cup_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1, k\neq 1, l\neq 1} E_{ijkl}). \tag{100}$$

From the joint AEP [29], $P(E_{1111}^c) \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. When $i \neq 1$, $j \neq 1$, and $(k,l) = (1,1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ij11} &= \sum_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1} P(E_{ij11}), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1} + R'_{p1}\right]} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1} + R'_{p1} - I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}) + 5\epsilon\right]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{ij11} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$R_{p1} + R'_{p1} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}). \tag{102}$$

Hence, if the condition in (102) is satisfied, then the probability of error λ_{i111} and λ_{1j11}, also goes to zero. When $k \neq 1$ and $(i,j,l) = (1,1,1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{11k1} &= \sum_{k\neq 1} P(E_{11k1}), \\
&\leq 2^{N\widetilde{R}_{cp1}} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1} - I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}) + 5\epsilon\right]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{11k1} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$\widetilde{R}_{cp1} \leq I(\mathbf{u}_1; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}). \tag{104}$$

When $l \neq 1$ and $(i, j, k) = (1, 1, 1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{111l} &= \sum_{l \neq 1} P(E_{111l}), \\
&\leq 2^{NR_{d2}} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N), \\
&\leq 2^{N[R_{d2} - I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{u}_1) + 5\epsilon]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{111l} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{u}_1). \tag{106}$$

When $i \neq 1, j \neq 1, k \neq 1$, and $l = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ijk1} &= \sum_{i \neq 1, j \neq 1, k \neq 1} P(E_{ijk1}), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{p1} + R'_{p1}\right]} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{p1} + R'_{p1} - I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{d2}) + 5\epsilon\right]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{ijk1} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$\widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{p1} + R'_{p1} \leq I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{d2}). \tag{108}$$

Hence, if the condition in (108) is satisfied, then the probability of error λ_{i1k1} and λ_{1jk1}, also goes to zero. When $k \neq 1, l \neq 1$, and $(i, j) = (1, 1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{11kl} &= \sum_{k \neq 1, l \neq 1} P(E_{11kl}), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{d2}\right]} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[\widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{d2} - I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}) + 5\epsilon\right]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{11kl} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$\widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{x}_{p1}). \tag{110}$$

When $i \neq 1, j \neq 1, l \neq 1$, and $k = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ij1l} &= \sum_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1, l\neq 1} P(E_{ij1l}), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1}+R'_{p1}+R_{d2}\right]} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{u}_1^N), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1}+R'_{p1}+R_{d2}-I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_1)+5\epsilon\right]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{ij1l} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$R_{p1} + R'_{p1} + R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_1). \tag{112}$$

Hence, if the condition in (112) is satisfied, then the probability of error λ_{i11l} and λ_{1j1l}, also goes to zero. When $i \neq 1, j \neq 1, k \neq 1,$ and $l \neq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{1jkl} &= \sum_{i\neq 1, j\neq 1, k\neq 1, l\neq 1} P(E_{ijkl}), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1}+R'_{p1}+\widetilde{R}_{cp1}+R_{d2}\right]} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{u}_1^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N) P(\mathbf{u}_1^N) P(\mathbf{x}_{d2}^N) P(\mathbf{y}_1^N), \\
&\leq 2^{N\left[R_{p1}+R'_{p1}+\widetilde{R}_{cp1}+R_{d2}-I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1)+5\epsilon\right]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{113}$$

Hence, $\lambda_{ijkl} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, if

$$R_{p1} + R'_{p1} + \widetilde{R}_{cp1} + R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_1). \tag{114}$$

Hence, if the condition in (114) is satisfied, then the probability of error in λ_{i1kl} and λ_{1jkl}, also goes to zero.

In a similar way, it can be shown that the probability of decoding error at receiver 2 goes to zero if following condition is satisfied.

$$\widetilde{R}_{cp2} \leq I(\mathbf{u}_2; \mathbf{y}_2). \tag{115}$$

Hence, the encoding and decoding error go to 0 as $N \to \infty$, if (102), (104), (106), (108), (110), (112) and (114) and (115). Then, by applying Fourier-Motzkin procedure [30] to these equations and the conditions for encoding error, the achievable rate in Theorem 6 can be obtained.

2) Equivocation computation: The equivocation at the receiver 2 is bounded as follows. As the non-intended cooperative private message is canceled completely at receiver 2, it is required to show the following as mentioned in Section H2.

$$H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) \geq N\left[R_{p1} - \epsilon_s\right]. \tag{116}$$

Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) &\geq H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N), \\
&= H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N), \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N), \\
&= H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) + H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N), \\
&\geq H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) + H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N), \\
&= R_{p1} + R'_{p1} + R_{d2} - I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N),
\end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

where (a) is obtained using the relation: $H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) = H(W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) + H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N)$. The second term in (117) is upper bounded as follows.

$$I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{u}_2^N) \leq NI(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{u}_2) + N\epsilon'. \tag{118}$$

The above bound can be obtained by using similar steps used in the proof of Lemma 1. To bound the last term in (117), consider the joint decoding of W'_{p1} and W_{d2}, assuming that the receiver 2 is given W_{p1} and $\mathbf{u}_2^N$ as side information. By following similar steps in Section H2, it is possible to show that the probability of error is arbitrarily small for large N, provided the following conditions are satisfied.

$$\begin{aligned}
&R'_{P1} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{x}_{d2}, \mathbf{u}_2), \;\; R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{u}_2), \\
&R'_{p1} + R_{d2} \leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{u}_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

When the conditions in (119) are satisfied and for sufficiently large N, following bound is obtained using Fano's inequality.

$$H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N|W_{p1} = w_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) \leq N\delta_2. \tag{120}$$

Finally, the last term in (117) is bounded as follows.

$$H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N | W_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_2^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) = \sum_{w_{p1}} P(w_{p1}) H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N | W_{p1} = w_{p1}, \mathbf{y}_1^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N),$$

$$\leq N\delta_2. \tag{121}$$

Using (118) and (121), (117) becomes

$$H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) \geq N\left[R_{p1} + R'_{p1} + R_{d2} - I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{u}_2) - (\delta_2 + \epsilon')\right], \tag{122}$$

By choosing $R'_{p1} = I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{u}_2) - \epsilon'_2$ and $R_{d2} = I(\mathbf{x}_{d2}; \mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{u}_2) - \epsilon''_2$ secrecy for the non-cooperative private part is ensured.

$$H(W_{p1}|\mathbf{y}_2^N) \geq N\left[R_{p1} - \epsilon_2\right]. \tag{123}$$

This completes the proof.

K. Proof of Corollary 2

In the first and second time slots, transmitters 1 and 2 send the following encoded messages.

$$\mathbf{x}_1(1) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[1](1) + \mathbf{x}_{p1}(1), \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_2(1) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[2](1) + \mathbf{x}_{d2}(1),$$

$$\mathbf{x}_1(2) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[1](2) + \mathbf{x}_{d1}(2), \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_2(2) = \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{cp}[2](2) + \mathbf{x}_{p2}(2). \tag{124}$$

In the following, the achievable secrecy rate and power allocation for different messages are discussed in case of first time slot. In the following, the time index is omitted. The mutual information given in Theorem 6 are evaluated as follows. From Theorem 6, R'_{p1} and R_{d2} are set as: $0.5\log\left(1 + \frac{h_c^2 P_{p1}}{1+h_d^2 P_{d2}}\right)$ and $0.5\log(1 + h_d^2 P_{d2})$, respectively. Consider the first equation in (20).

$$R_1 = \min\left[0.5\log(1 + \sigma_{u1}^2 + h_d^2 P_{p1}), 0.5\log(1 + h_d^2 P_{p1}) + \min\left\{0.5\log(1 + \sigma_{u1}^2), C\right\}\right] - R'_{p1}, \tag{125}$$

The second equation in (20) reduces to following.

$$R_1 \leq \left[0.5\log(1 + \sigma_{u1}^2 + h_d^2 P_{p1} + h_c^2 P_{d2}), 0.5\log(1 + \sigma_{u1}^2 + h_c^2 P_{d2}) + \min\left\{0.5\log(1 + \sigma_{u1}^2), C\right\},\right.$$

$$\left. 0.5\log(1 + h_d^2 P_{p1}) + 0.5\log(1 + \sigma_{u1}^2 + h_c^2 P_{d2})\right] - (R'_{p1} + R_{d2}). \tag{126}$$

The third equation in (20) reduces to following.

$$R_1 \leq 0.5\log(1+h_d^2P_{p1}+h_c^2P_{d2})+0.5\log(1+\sigma_{u1}^2+h_c^2P_{d2})-(R'_{p1}+2R_{d2}). \tag{127}$$

Consider the fourth equation in (20).

$$R_2 = \min\left\{0.5\log\left(1+\frac{\sigma_{u2}^2}{1+h_d^2P_{d2}+h_c^2P_{p1}}\right), C\right\}. \tag{128}$$

As $R_{d2} = 0.5\log(1+h_d^2P_{d2}) < 0.5\log(1+h_c^2P_{d2})$, R_{d2} satisfies the last inequality in (20). Now, consider the power allocation for the private cooperative message, non-cooperative private message and dummy message as shown below. The encoded messages at transmitters 1 and 2 are:

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = h_d\mathbf{w}_{1z} - h_c\mathbf{w}_{2z} + \mathbf{x}_{p1}, \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_2 = h_d\mathbf{w}_{2z} - h_c\mathbf{w}_{1z} + \mathbf{x}_{d2}. \tag{129}$$

To simplify the power allocation, the variance of $\mathbf{w}_{1z}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{2z}$ are chosen to be same. In order to satisfy the power constraint, the following conditions need to be satisfied.

$$(h_d^2+h_c^2)\sigma_z^2 + P_{p1} \leq P_1, \text{ and } (h_d^2+h_c^2)\sigma_z^2 + P_{d2} \leq P_2, \tag{130}$$

where $P_i = \beta_i P\,(i=1,2)$ and $0 \leq \beta_i \leq 1$. The power for the non-cooperative private message, cooperative private message and dummy message are chosen as follows:

$$\sigma_z^2 = \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_1+\theta_2}\frac{P_1}{h_d^2+h_c^2}, P_{p1} = \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1+\theta_2}P_1, \text{ and } P_{d2} = (P_2-(h_d^2+h_c^2)\sigma_z^2)^+. \tag{131}$$

where $\theta_i \in [0,1]$. The parameter θ_i and β_i are the power splitting and power control parameter, respectively. Hence, θ_i and β_i are chosen such that the rate in (125)-(128) are maximized and the minimum of (125)-(127) gives the achievable secrecy rate for the transmitter 1 i.e., $R_1^*(1)$ and (128) gives the achievable secrecy rate for the transmitter 2. i.e., $R_2^*(1)$. In a similar way, the achievable secrecy rate $R_1^*(2)$ and $R_1^*(2)$ can be determined in the second time slot. This completes the proof.

L. Proof of Lemma 1

Let $T_\epsilon^{(N)}(P_{X_{p1},X_{p2},X_{d2},U_2,Y_2})$ denote the set of typical sequences $(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N)$ with respect to $P(x_{p1}, x_{p2}, x_{d2}, u_2, y_2)$. Define the following indicator random variable.

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N) = \begin{cases} 1 & (\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N) \notin T_\epsilon^N(P_{X_{p1},X_{p2},X_{d2},U_2,Y_2}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{132}$$

Now, $I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N)$ is bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) &\leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \psi; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N), \\ &= I(\psi; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) + I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \psi). \end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

Consider the first term in (133).

$$I(\psi; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) \leq H(\psi) \leq 1. \tag{134}$$

Consider the second term in (133).

$$I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \psi) = \sum_{j=0}^{1} P(\psi = j) I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \psi = j). \tag{135}$$

When $j = 1$, then $(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N) \notin T_\epsilon^{(N)}$ and the following bound is obtained.

$$\begin{aligned} P(\psi = 1) I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \psi = 1) &\leq P\left\{(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N) \notin T_\epsilon^{(N)}\right\} H(\mathbf{y}_2^N), \\ &\leq N\epsilon_3 \log |\mathcal{Y}_2|. \end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

When $j = 0$, then $(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}$ and the following bound is obtained.

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\psi = 0) I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \psi = 0) \\ &\leq I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N; \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \psi = 0), \\ &\leq \sum_{(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N) \in T_\epsilon^{(N)}} P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N) \left[\log P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N, \mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N)\right. \\ &\qquad \left. - \log P(\mathbf{y}_2^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N) - \log P(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N, \mathbf{x}_{d2}^N | \mathbf{x}_{p2}^N, \mathbf{u}_2^N)\right], \\ &\leq N\left[H(\mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2) + H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2} | \mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2) - H(\mathbf{x}_{p1}, \mathbf{x}_{d2}, \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2) + 3\epsilon_3\right], \\ &= N\left[I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}; \mathbf{y}_2 | \mathbf{x}_{p2}, \mathbf{u}_2) + 3\epsilon_2\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

From (134)-(137), (133) is bounded as follows.

$$I(\mathbf{x}_{p1}^N;\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{x}_{p2}^N,\mathbf{u}_2^N) \leq NI(\mathbf{x}_{p1};\mathbf{y}_2|\mathbf{x}_{p2},\mathbf{u}_2)+N\epsilon_3', \tag{138}$$

where $\epsilon_3'=\epsilon_3'\log|\mathcal{Y}_2|+3\epsilon_2+\frac{1}{N}$. This completes the proof.

M. Proof of Theorem 7

Using Fano's inequality, the rate of user 1 is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N)+N\epsilon_N,\\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} h(\mathbf{y}_1^N)-h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|W_1,\mathbf{x}_1^N)+N\epsilon_N,\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} h(\mathbf{y}_1^N)-h(h_c\mathbf{x}_2^N+\mathbf{z}_1^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N,W_1,\mathbf{x}_1^N)+N\epsilon_N,\\
&\overset{(c)}{=} h(\mathbf{y}_1^N)-h(h_c\mathbf{x}_2^N+\mathbf{z}_1^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N)+N\epsilon_N,\\
&\overset{(d)}{=} h(\mathbf{y}_1^N)-h(h_c\mathbf{x}_2^N+\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}_1^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N)+N\epsilon_N,\\
\text{or } h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) &\leq h(\mathbf{y}_1^N)-NR_1+N\epsilon_N, \text{ where } \widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N\triangleq h_c\mathbf{x}_2^N+\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}_1^N,
\end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

where (a) and (b) follows by using the fact that the entropy cannot increase by additional conditioning; (c) follows by using the relation in (3) and (d) is obtained using the fact that, the secrecy capacity region of an interference channel with confidential messages is invariant under a joint channel noise distribution $P(z_1,z_2)$, as long as it leads to the same marginal distribution $P(z_1)$ and $P(z_2)$ [28]. Although, this invariance property is stated for GIC, it is not difficult to see that this property holds for the GIC with limited-rate transmitter cooperation.

Adopting similar steps used to obtain (139), the following bound on the conditional entropy is obtained.

$$h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) \leq h(\mathbf{y}_2^N)-NR_2+N\epsilon_N, \text{ where } \widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N\triangleq h_c\mathbf{x}_1^N+\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}_2^N, \tag{140}$$

The rate of user 1 can also be bounded as

$$
\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N) + N\epsilon, \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N) - I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon', \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) - I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon', \\
&= I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon', \\
&= h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&= h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) - h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&= h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) + h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) - h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&= I(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N;\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) + h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} I(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N;\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N,\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + I(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N;\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) \\
&\qquad - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N) + H(\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) - h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N,\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) \\
&\qquad + h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1) + N\epsilon', \\
&\overset{(e)}{\leq} H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N) + H(\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) - h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N,\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N,\mathbf{x}_1^N,\mathbf{x}_2^N) \\
&\qquad + h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{y}_2^N,W_1,\mathbf{x}_1^N,\mathbf{x}_2^N) + N\epsilon', \\
&= H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N) + H(\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) + h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{v}_{12}^N,\mathbf{v}_{21}^N) - h(\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}_2^N) \\
&\qquad + h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{z}_1^N) + N\epsilon', \qquad (141)
\end{aligned}
$$

where (a) is obtained using the secrecy constraint at receiver 2; (b) is due to the genie providing $\mathbf{y}_2^N$ to receiver 1; (c) is obtained using the relation $h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) = h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N) + h(\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N|\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N)$; (d) is obtained using chain rule for mutual information and (e) is obtained using the fact that removing conditioning cannot decrease the entropy and conditioning cannot

increase the entropy. Using (139) and (140), (141) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} N[2R_1+R_2] &\leq H(\mathbf{v}_{12}^N)+H(\mathbf{v}_{21}^N)+h(\mathbf{y}_1^N)+h(\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{y}_2^N|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^N,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^N) \\ &\quad -h(\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}_1^N)-h(\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}_2^N)-h(\mathbf{z}_1^N)+N\epsilon'', \\ \text{or } R &\leq \max_{0\leq|\rho|\leq 1}\frac{1}{3}\left[2C+0.5\log\left(1+\text{SNR}+\text{INR}+2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}\right)+0.5\log\det\left(\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{142}$$

In the above equation, ρ, det(.) and $\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}}$ are as defined in the statement of the theorem. The second term in (142) is obtained by using the fact that differential entropy is maximized by the Gaussian distribution for a given power constraint. Hence, the following holds.

$$h(\mathbf{y}_1)\leq 0.5\log\left(2\pi e\left(1+\text{SNR}+\text{INR}+2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}\right)\right). \tag{143}$$

where SNR and INR are as defined in the statement of the theorem. The last term in (142) is obtained as follows.

$$h(\mathbf{y}_1,\mathbf{y}_2|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1,\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2)\leq 0.5\log\det\left(2\pi e\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}}\right), \tag{144}$$

where $\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}}=\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}-\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}},\bar{\mathbf{s}}}\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}^{-1}\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}},\bar{\mathbf{s}}}^T$, $\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}=E[\bar{\mathbf{y}}\bar{\mathbf{y}}^T]$, $\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{y}},\bar{\mathbf{s}}}=E[\bar{\mathbf{y}}\bar{\mathbf{s}}^T]$, $\Sigma_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}=E[\bar{\mathbf{s}}\bar{\mathbf{s}}^T]$, $\bar{\mathbf{y}}\triangleq[\mathbf{y}_1\ \ \mathbf{y}_2]^T$ and $\bar{\mathbf{s}}\triangleq[\widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_1\ \ \widetilde{\mathbf{s}}_2]^T$. The evaluation of these terms are given in the statement of the theorem. This completes the proof.

N. Proof of Theorem 8

Using Fano's inequality, the rate of user 1 is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} NR_1 &\leq I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N)+N\epsilon_N, \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N,\mathbf{x}_2^N)+N\epsilon_N, \\ &= I(W_1;\mathbf{x}_2^N)+I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_1^N|\mathbf{x}_2^N)+N\epsilon_N, \\ &= I(W_1;\mathbf{x}_2^N)+h(\mathbf{s}_1'^N|\mathbf{x}_2^N)-h(\mathbf{s}_1'^N|\mathbf{x}_2^N,W_1)+N\epsilon_N,\ \text{where } \mathbf{s}_1'^N\triangleq h_d\mathbf{x}_1^N+\mathbf{z}_1^N, \\ &= I(W_1;\mathbf{x}_2^N)+I(W_1;\mathbf{s}_1'^N|\mathbf{x}_2^N)+N\epsilon_N, \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} I(W_1;\mathbf{x}_2^N,\mathbf{s}_1'^N)+N\epsilon_N, \\ &\overset{(c)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{s}_1'^N)-I(W_1;\mathbf{y}_2^N)+I(W_1;\mathbf{x}_2^N|\mathbf{s}_1'^N)+N\epsilon_N', \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{s}'^N_1,\mathbf{y}^N_2) - I(W_1;\mathbf{y}^N_2) + I(W_1;\mathbf{x}^N_2|\mathbf{s}'^N_1) + N\epsilon'_N,\\
&= I(W_1;\mathbf{s}'^N_1|\mathbf{y}^N_2) + I(W_1;\mathbf{x}^N_2|\mathbf{s}'^N_1) + N\epsilon'_N,\\
&\overset{(e)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{s}'^N_1|\mathbf{y}^N_2) + I(W_1;\mathbf{x}^N_2,\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}|\mathbf{s}'^N_1) + N\epsilon'_N,\\
&= I(W_1;\mathbf{s}'^N_1|\mathbf{y}^N_2) + I(W_1;\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}|\mathbf{s}'^N_1) + I(W_1;\mathbf{x}^N_2|\mathbf{s}'^N_1,\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}) + N\epsilon'_N,\\
&\leq I(W_1;\mathbf{s}'^N_1|\mathbf{y}^N_2) + H(\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}|\mathbf{s}'^N_1) + h(\mathbf{x}^N_2|\mathbf{s}'^N_1,\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}) - h(\mathbf{x}^N_2|\mathbf{s}'^N_1,\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21},W_1) + N\epsilon'_N,\\
&\overset{(f)}{\leq} h(\mathbf{s}'^N_1|\mathbf{y}^N_2) - h(\mathbf{s}'^N_1|\mathbf{y}^N_2,W_1) + H(\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}) + N\epsilon'_N,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text{or } R_1 \leq \max_{0\leq|\rho|\leq 1}\left[2C + 0.5\log\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}'|\mathbf{y}_2}\right], \tag{145}
$$

where (a) is due to the genie providing $\mathbf{x}^N_2$ to receiver 1; (b) is obtained using chain rule for mutual information; (c) is obtained using secrecy constraint at receiver 2; (d) is due to the genie providing $\mathbf{y}^N_2$ as side information to receiver 1, where $\mathbf{x}^N_2$ is eliminated, (e) is obtained using the relation $I(W_1;\mathbf{x}^N_2,\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}|\mathbf{s}'^N_1) = I(W_1;\mathbf{x}^N_2|\mathbf{s}'^N_1) + I(W_1;\mathbf{v}^N_{12},\mathbf{v}^N_{21}|\mathbf{s}'^N_1,\mathbf{x}^N_2)$ and (f) is obtained using the Markov relation in (3) and removing conditioning does not decrease the entropy.

The last term is obtained using the fact that the differential entropy is maximized by the Gaussian distribution for a given power constraint. The term $\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}'|\mathbf{y}_2}$ is evaluated as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}'|\mathbf{y}_2} = E[\mathbf{s}'^2_1] - E[\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{y}_2]^2E[\mathbf{y}^2_2]^{-1} &= 1 + \text{SNR} - \frac{\left(\rho\text{SNR} + \sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}\right)^2}{1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}},\\
&= 1 + \frac{\text{SNR} + \text{SNR}^2(1-\rho^2)}{1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{146}
$$

This completes the proof.

O. Proof of Theorem 9

Using Fano's inequality, the rate of user 1 is upper bounded as

$$
\begin{aligned}
NR_1 &\leq I(W_1;\mathbf{y}^N_1) + N\epsilon_N,\\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{y}^N_1) - I(W_1;\mathbf{y}^N_2) + N\epsilon'_N,\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(W_1;\mathbf{y}^N_1,\mathbf{y}^N_2) - I(W_1;\mathbf{y}^N_2) + N\epsilon'_N,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_2^N) - I(W_1; \mathbf{y}_2^N) + N\epsilon'_N, \\
&\leq h(\mathbf{y}_1^N | \mathbf{y}_2^N) - h(\mathbf{z}_1^N) + N\epsilon'_N, \\
\text{or } R_1 &\leq \max_{0 \leq |\rho| \leq 1} 0.5 \log \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{y}_2}, \qquad (147)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{y}_2}$ is obtained as given below.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{y}_2} &= E[\mathbf{y}_1^2] - E[\mathbf{y}_1\mathbf{y}_2]^2 E[\mathbf{y}_2^2]^{-1}, \\
&= 1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} - \frac{(2\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}} + \rho(\text{SNR} + \text{INR}))^2}{1 + \text{SNR} + \text{INR} + 2\rho\sqrt{\text{SNR INR}}}. \qquad (148)
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting the value of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{y}_2}$ from (148) in (147), results in (26) and this completes the proof.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Mohapatra and C. R. Murthy, "Secrecy in the 2-user symmetric deterministic interference channel with transmitter cooperation," in *Proc. IEEE 14th Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC'2013)*, 2013, pp. 270–274.

[2] ——, "Outer bounds on the secrecy rate of the 2-user symmetric deterministic interference channel with transmitter cooperation," in *Proc. National Conference on Communications (NCC'2014)*, To appear.

[3] C. Shannon, "Communication theory of secrecy systems," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 656–715, Oct. 1949.

[4] A. Wyner, "The wire-tap channel," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1334–1387, Oct. 1975.

[5] I. Csiszar and J. Korner, "Broadcast channels with confidential messages," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 339–348, May 1978.

[6] A. Carleial, "A case where interference does not reduce capacity (corresp.)," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 569–570, 1975.

[7] H. Sato, "The capacity of the gaussian interference channel under strong interference (corresp.)," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 786–788, 1981.

[8] R. Etkin, D. Tse, and H. Wang, "Gaussian interference channel capacity to within one bit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 5534–5562, Dec. 2008.

[9] R. Liu, I. Maric, P. Spasojević, and R. Yates, "Discrete memoryless interference and broadcast channels with confidential messages: Secrecy rate regions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 2493–2507, Jun. 2008.

[10] X. Tang, R. Liu, P. Spasojević, and H. Poor, "Interference assisted secret communication," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 3153–3167, May 2011.

[11] O. Koyluoglu, H. El Gamal, L. Lai, and H. Poor, "Interference alignment for secrecy," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 3323–3332, Jun. 2011.

[12] O. Koyluoglu and H. El Gamal, "Cooperative encoding for secrecy in interference channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 5682–5694, Sep. 2011.

[13] X. He and A. Yener, "The gaussian many-to-one interference channel with confidential messages," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 2730–2745, May 2011.

[14] E. Ekrem and S. Ulukus, "Effects of cooperation on the secrecy of multiple access channels with generalized feedback," in *Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*, Mar. 2008, pp. 791–796.

[15] ——, "Secrecy in cooperative relay broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 137–155, Jan. 2011.

[16] Z. H. Awan, A. Zaidi, and L. Vandendorpe, "Multiaccess channel with partially cooperating encoders and security constraints," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1205.6852, 2012.

[17] L. Lai and H. El Gamal, "The relay-eavesdropper channel: Cooperation for secrecy," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 4005–4019, 2008.

[18] V. Aggarwal, L. Sankar, A. Calderbank, and H. Poor, "Secrecy capacity of a class of orthogonal relay eavesdropper channels," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, vol. 2009, no. 1, p. 494696, 2009.

[19] E. Perron, S. Diggavi, and I. Telatar, "On cooperative secrecy for discrete memoryless relay networks," in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT'2010)*, 2010, pp. 2573–2577.

[20] A. Avestimehr, S. Diggavi, and D. Tse, "Wireless network information flow: A deterministic approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 1872–1905, Apr. 2011.

[21] R. Yates, D. Tse, and Z. Li, "Secret communication on interference channels," in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT'2008)*, Jul. 2008, pp. 374–378.

[22] E. Perron, S. Diggavi, and E. Telatar, "On cooperative wireless network secrecy," in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM' 2009*, Apr. 2009, pp. 1935–1943.

[23] M. El-Halabi, T. Liu, C. Georghiades, and S. Shamai, "Secret writing on dirty paper: A deterministic view," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3419–3429, Jun. 2012.

[24] Z. Li, R. Yates, and W. Trappe, "Secrecy capacity region of a class of one-sided interference channel," in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT'2008)*, 2008, pp. 379–383.

[25] K. Marton, "A coding theorem for the discrete memoryless broadcast channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 306–311, 1979.

[26] I. Wang and D. Tse, "Interference mitigation through limited transmitter cooperation," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 2941–2965, May 2011.

[27] F. M. J. Willems, "The discrete memoryless multiple access channel with partially cooperating encoders (corresp.)," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 441–445, 1983.

[28] X. He and A. Yener, "A new outer bound for the gaussian interference channel with confidential messages," in *Information Sciences and Systems, 2009. CISS 2009. 43rd Annual Conference on*, 2009, pp. 318–323.

[29] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

[30] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[31] G. Kramer, "Topics in multi-user information theory," *Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 4, no. 45, pp. 265–444, 2008. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/0100000028



Fig. 7. Outer bound on the secrecy rate of the SLDIC with $m = 5$ and $n = 4$.



Fig. 8. Outer bound on the secrecy rate of the SLDIC with $m = 3$ and $n = 6$.



Fig. 9. Normalized rate for the SLDIC with $C = 0$.



Fig. 10. Normalized rate for the SLDIC with $C = 50$.



Fig. 11. Outer bound on the symmetric secrecy rate for GSIC with $C = 0$, $P = 100$ and $h_d = 1$. In the legend, MM stands for the outer bound derived in this work, HY stands for the outer bound on secrecy rate in [28] and TP stands for the outer bound derived in [10].



Fig. 12. Secrecy rate in case of GSIC with $P = 100$ and $C = 0$.



Fig. 13. Secrecy rate in case of GSIC with $P = 100$ and $C = 1$.



Fig. 14. Secrecy rate in case of GSIC with $P = 100$ and $C = 10$.